THE CHURCH ENCHAINED

WM. A. R. GOODWIN

Class BV 600
Book .S67
Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

THE CHURCH ENCHAINED

THE CHURCH ENCHAINED

BY THE
REV. WM. A. R. GOODWIN, D.D.
Rector of St. Paul's Church, Rochester, N. Y.
Author of the History of Bruton Parish Church, and
the History of Bruton Parish Church Restored

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE
RT. REV. DAVID H. GREER, D.D., LL.D.
Bishop of the Diocese of New York

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY
681 FIFTH AVENUE
1916

BV600
.G67

Copyright, 1916,
by
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY

$1.75

Printed in the United States of America

JUL 19 1916

©Cl.A433776

No. 1.

DEDICATION

To all those who pray for a perfect willingness to suffer the loss of all things "that they may win Christ, and be found in Him"; who, as Prophets, proclaim the truth that makes men free, "come whence it may, and cost what it may"; who, as Priests, consent to offer costly sacrifice, that all may come "into the glorious liberty of the children of God"; and who, as servants of Christ, desire to express a comprehensive faith in co-operative service to the Glory of God in the extension of His Kingdom among men; these pages, devoted to the search for truth and freedom, and an ultimate divine order, are humbly dedicated.

PREFACE

The thoughts relative to Christ and His Church and the world's great need expressed in this book are communicated because of the hope that, through the blessing of the Spirit of truth, they may minister to the building up of the Body of Christ in love.

We seek the truth under human limitations. Often, in its pursuit, we follow false trails. Sometimes right trails are wrongly followed. The by-path is mistaken for the King's highway. The point we reach is heralded as the ultimate viewpoint. The further and more far-reaching viewpoints not yet attained are not postulated as possible. A stake is driven down; a barrier is built, and seekers after truth are warned and prohibited from venturing beyond the limit fixed.

The truth incarnate has ever been enchained. We hear the clank of the chains by which the Church has been bound as we trace her history through the centuries. Sometimes these bonds have been imposed upon the Church, and upon seekers after truth, from without. As men "took Jesus and bound Him," as they chained St. Paul, and John Huss, and Jerome, and Lattimer, and John Bunyan, so the world powers, and the powers of darkness, have bound the Body of Christ. These chains, externally imposed, have ever served to test and manifest the power of the life divine, and have been the means of giving witness to the conquering strength of the spirit of liberty and truth.

The chains that have really bound the Christ, and which have delimited the freedom of the Church, and hindered her in the fulfillment of her divinely given mission to be His witness, have been forged in the mind and heart and will of the members of His Body.

The chains forged by the logical processes of thought which seek to confine the boundless love

of God, and the free grace revealed in the Great Gospel of redemption; the chains forged by the narrow definitions and exalted pride and bigotry of ecclesiasticism, which bind the creative and redemptive forces of Christianity; the chains wrought out of the Church's trust in material power; the iron chains of bigotry, and the golden chains of luxury, and self-indulgence and the love of pleasure; and the chains which are unconsciously forged by the habits of neglect and indifference and procrastination; these are the bonds which have ever bound the Body of Christ.

These chains bind His Church to-day. Called and challenged by the world crisis to help and heal sorrowing and suffering millions, and to restrain the ambition and wrath of man, the Church finds herself enchained. She stands unprepared in the presence of her greatest opportunity and responsibility. Sent to minister in His name to the poor, the broken-hearted, the captives, and to give men liberty, she hears the call, "Come over and help us," but she is not

AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Cordial appreciation is expressed, and grateful acknowledgment is here made of the kindness of the Right Reverend Doctor David H. Greer, Bishop of New York, for reading the manuscript, and for writing the introduction to this book; to the Rev. Dr. Cosby Bell, Professor of Theology of the Theological Seminary in Virginia; the Reverend Editor of the *Southern Churchman;* and Mr. George Wharton Pepper of Philadelphia, who were kind enough to read the manuscript, and who offered valuable and helpful suggestions. This acknowledgment does not carry with it any intention of making these honoured churchmen in any way responsible for the views set forth.

William A. R. Goodwin.

St. Paul's Church,
Rochester, N. Y.
Easter, 1916.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
INTRODUCTION BY BISHOP GREER		xvii
PART I—THE CRISIS AND THE CALL		
CHAPTER		
I	THE CRISIS AND THE CHURCH .	3
II	THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH TO IMPERILLED AMERICA	18
III	MATERIALISM	31
IV	CIVILISATION	40
V	THE SPIRITUAL MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH	51
VI	THE TRAGEDY OF UNPREPAREDNESS	63
PART II—ECCLESIASTICISM AND CHRISTIANITY. FORM AND SPIRIT.		
VII	THE PURPOSE PREVIEWED . .	83
VIII	LOGIC AND CATHOLICITY . . .	90
IX	THE INTENTION AND EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH	93
X	THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE SYLLOGISM	98
XI	THE REFORMATION A DISTINCTLY CATHOLIC MOVEMENT	102
XII	CAN THE CHURCH BE DEFINED?	105
XIII	THE CHURCH UNDER A DESCRIPTIVE TITLE	113
XIV	THE MESSAGE OF THE TRANSITION	126
XV	THE TERMS "CATHOLIC" AND "CATHOLIC SANCTION" . . .	134

CHAPTER		PAGE
XVI	The Appeal to the Past	155
XVII	The Ancient Paths	159
XVIII	Individualism	163
XIX	The Horns of a Dilemma	167
XX	The Paradoxes of Truth	174
XXI	The Central Ground Position	177
XXII	The Language of Courtesy and of Controversy	182
XXIII	The Fence Through the Middle Ground	186
XXIV	The Priest and the Monk	188
XXV	The Prophet and the Denominational Minister	197
XXVI	Necessary Restrictions Upon Liberty	202
XXVII	The Perils of Protestantism	217
XXVIII	The Peril of Orders	227
XXIX	What Would Become of the Prayer Book	234
XXX	The Defence and the Exemplification of the Power of Orders	238
XXXI	What We May and What We Cannot Hold	243
XXXII	Ancient Land Marks	247

PART III—CONFERENCE—CO-OPERATION—UNITY

XXXIII	Are We Prepared?	251
XXXIV	The Challenge	257
XXXV	"The Church" and "This Church"	260
XXXVI	Conference and Co-operation	263
XXXVII	Movements Toward Unity	277

CHAPTER		PAGE
XXXVIII	Our Position with Reference to the Orthodox Eastern Church	285
XXXIX	Our Position with Reference to the Roman Catholic Church	289
XL	Conference and Co-operation with Protestant Communions	305
XLI	The Recognition of the Layman by this Church	311
XLII	The Way Prepared for this Church	320
XLIII	The World, the Work, the Waste, Co-Workers	324
XLIV	The Restraint of Power	333
XLV	A Conference and Co-operative Commission	338
XLVI	The Temporary Nature and the Mission of Federated Movements	342
XLVII	Federation and Religious Education	353
XLVIII	The Price of Consistency	363
XLIX	The Question of Unity	366
L	The Vision of the Son of Man	371

INTRODUCTION

BY

THE RT. REV. DAVID HUMMELL GREER,
D. D., LL. D.,
Bishop of the Diocese of New York.

DR. GOODWIN has given us in the following pages a strong and timely word. It is positive and forceful but not polemical and contentious. He speaks with conviction but not with intolerance, and whether or not we agree with him we cannot fail to recognize and admire his courtesy and fairness towards those who differ with him. In this respect, he not only sets an example which, in these days of much heat and little light both in Church and State, it would be well for the rest of us to follow, but also strikes the true catholic note and expresses

or reflects the true catholic mind. For what is catholicity?—that very much mooted and much disputed word and about which there seems to be, as Dr. Goodwin shows, no catholic agreement. In what does it consist? Not in a fixed and rigorous definition or dogmatic declaration established once for all. That is the definition of the sectary with the seeds of schism in it. It is not so much a declaration as a disposition: not a disposition to surrender its convictions or to hold them lightly, but one which, while adhering to them, is not delimited by them, but has learned the secret, the catholic secret, of how to keep and hold without any break or excision in it a fellowship beyond them. A recent reviewer has said of Charles Lamb that he was certainly never surpassed and probably not equalled by any contemporary for understanding those with whom he did not agree. That is the catholic mind, which, if rarely found in literature, is still more rarely found in theology and religion or the Councils of the Church. It is, however, a type of mind in which the hope

of the ultimate unity of Christendom resides and which should be sedulously cultivated by all schools of thought in the Christian Church. That is the type of mind reflected in Dr. Goodwin's treatise, which, while expressing definitely and clearly and with no uncertain sound, his deep and strong convictions, is written in a truly catholic tone and temper. It is a notable book, both in what it says and the spirit in which it says it, and will well repay a close and careful reading.

David H. Greer.

PART I

THE CRISIS AND THE CALL

"Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?"

CHAPTER I

THE CRISIS AND THE CHURCH

IN the presence of the great world crisis, Christianity and the Christian Church stand for judgment. It is asked by many, "Has Christianity failed?" When asked this question by a young student, the president of one of our universities answered: "It has never been tried." This question cannot be answered and dismissed with a "yes" or "no." Christianity has succeeded in doing many things; in many things she has deplorably failed. That she failed to stem the forces which culminated in the present world catastrophe is apparent. Yet it is evident that the desires, the ambitions, the materialism, the inordinate greed, and the will to power, which have com-

bined to cause the greatest war of the world, are all motives and impulses directly contrary to her fundamental principles, and to the Spirit and teachings of Jesus Christ. The great war is, indeed, the most striking vindication in human history of the truth of the Christian contention. As nothing has ever done before, it manifests the necessity for obeying the spiritual laws proclaimed by Christ, and of living life in the power of His Spirit, if a just and abiding peace is to be established among the nations of the earth.

It is well that thinking men should pause and carefully consider in what ways, and for what reasons, the Christian Church has failed to impress the consciousness of the races at war, and the world consciousness at large, with a force and intensity sufficient to guide into the paths of integrity and peace the desire of the nations, and the wills of those who are now working their will in devastation, wholesale slaughter and mutual destruction.

The causes for this failure in the Church, in

so far as they still inhere in the Church, exist there as a tragedy. If, in view of the call which now comes to the Christian Church, these causes of weakness are allowed to continue to retard her influence and paralyse her power, the world will, when it pauses to take inventory, condemn and despise the Church for her lack of vision; for her impotence, born of pride, prejudice and arrogance; for her lack of power because of her lack of unity; for having proven recreant to her trust; and for having utterly failed to speak and exemplify the mind and heart of the Christ to the world in the darkest hour of her life, and in the day of her deepest distress, and of her profoundest need.

It is the solemn duty of the Christian Church, and of all Christian men, to ask the causes of the tragic failure of the one force which might have prevented this tragedy had it been vital, united, and consecrated fully to its Christ-given mission to the world. This duty is imperative, and must be faced with great sacrificial renunciation unless we are willing that the causes

of the Church's failure shall be written in the book of doom which will tell future generations why suddenly the whole world fabric seemed to collapse. It is imperative for the reason, also, that we face a future pregnant with the most vital and stupendous problems and responsibilities which have ever challenged the thought, and will, and faith of man.

"WHERE IS NOW THY GOD?"

Infidelity, skepticism, materialism, heathendom turn to-day to the Christian Church and ask, "Where is now thy God?" Browning has answered,

> "God's in His heaven—
> All's right with the world."

But Zeppelin bombs were not then dropping around him out of the blue Italian sky upon the ancient glories of Venice. At present all's wrong with the world, and God, where is He now? The doors of many parts of His heaven are closed to Him. By neglect, He is to-day

being excluded, here in America, from the minds of millions of His children by the ignorance that is in them by reason of the entire lack of all religious education, both on Sundays and on week days. Sectarian strife and ecclesiastical bigotry have shut Him out of our public schools. Materialism, agnosticism and infidelity have banished Him from the laboratories and class rooms of many of our most renowned universities.

Greed and covetousness have forced Him out of conference and co-partnership relation with many of our banking, commercial, and industrial corporations. It is said they have no soul. If the directors of big business fail to feel their responsibility to incorporate their souls into their business, then corporations have no point of contact with God. The exiled God is not satisfied. Through His broken laws, and in the brutal passions of men, He is uttering His protest. Through the cannon's mouth, He is appealing for His divine right to be enthroned in the hearts of His children, and to govern

the unruly wills and affections of sinful men. With the roar of artillery He would wake the slumbering souls of His children, and deafen the voice of prejudice and bigotry that keeps His Church from being one in its witness-bearing power, and in its readiness to serve, even though, as yet, she cannot become one in formal and organic unity. Through the appalling need of the world, through the carnage and blood of far-scattered battle fields, through the cry of fatherless children, through the lamentation of widows left desolate, through the pallor of death on the faces of the splendid youth who lie fresh slain beneath the silent stars, through the songs which float from bivouacked hosts encamped ready for to-morrow's ordeal of slaughter; from hunger and famine, from pestilence and death, from souls in their flight to Paradise, and from the open gates of Hell (for "war is hell"), the voice of God is calling to His Church to consider what her neglect, and what man's neglect of her and of Him, have brought to pass in the earth.

THE CALL OF THE NEAR FUTURE

We cannot tell when over the battle fields there will be unfurled flags which will tell that the fight is done. The guns will be rolled away. Swords, encrimsoned with blood, will be sheathed. The mind and the heart of man will still pulse and throb. What voice shall speak to them? Shall it be the voice of ancient animosities? Shall it be still the voice of the will to power? Shall material ambition still call most loudly to the nations? Shall memories of ravished women and of ruthless devastation appeal to the spirit of revenge? Shall the blood of brothers and fathers slain cry aloud for vengeance to the childhood of to-day, and to the youth of to-morrow? Shall the nations hear no other voices than these?

Shall they hear America's voice? What will it say to them? Will it be guttural with the fat of the gain it has gotten out of the tragedy of its brothers over the seas? Shall it be the covetous voice of commercialism that shall first

sweep over the ocean and break upon the desolate and deathly calm of prostrate and impoverished peoples? Shall it be the voice of Shylock or of Portia that shall pass from our shores to ring through the encrêped halls of judgment when the nations shall come at last to face their creditors? What will America have to say, and what will she have to give in that day?

Will she stretch out clean hands, and speak with a great purity of heart to the nations when the day of opportunity comes?

America must be very clearly told that this day of her opportunity will be, also, the day of her greatest judgment. The nations will, on that day, be prepared, in part at least, to forgive her wavering neutrality. They will understand the perplexities with which her mind was surrounded. They will pardon mistakes of judgment. But they will be in no humour to pardon cupidity. If America goes as a vulture, seeking what she may devour; if she goes as to a bargain counter of a house which has fallen under disaster; if she goes as a merchant with

outstretched hands to get more gold out of the bargains which she may force by reason of human needs and human misfortune, she will have then doomed herself to the scorn and lasting contempt of prostrate nations. America will then have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. She will then have given evidence of a prostitution of spirit so base that perhaps nothing short of the purification of the fires of war could purge her own life from the dross of selfishness and materialism.

And what voice shall speak to the heart and conscience of America? Is there a power in the Christian Church at this crisis moment for adequate leadership? Is there a priestly voice to call America to the altar of self-sacrifice, that she may there make a great renunciation? Is there the possibility of a solidarity of life, and a practical unity of forces, out of which the prophet's voice may call America to a great consecration to a Christlike service. If many voices are to speak, they must speak as one voice. Back of the many voices there must

be a consciousness of solidarity of mind, and heart, and purpose. If the nations are to be built into a deep and abiding consciousness of their interdependence; if they are to be bound by ties of brotherhood into a lasting peace, the spirit of the Prince of Peace must lead them. Shall America voice that spirit? That she is armed for defence will make her voice more potent. Her own preparedness will give to her appeals for brotherhood a clearer note of sincerity. If she is herself adequately strong, she can strongly appeal for the weak. But will her preparedness be in her armament alone, or in her prepared spirit also? Surely out of the open heavens alone can come this spirit of leadership. Who shall call it down? Who shall point the nation to the vision of those things essential to her true greatness, and to her permanent and honourable peace? Who shall lead America that America may lead the world?

What has the Christian Church in this land said that has counted for anything in bringing to bear upon our National Government a com-

pelling sense of its duty and responsibility to protest in the name of Christ and humanity against the fiendish and brutal Armenian massacres, which have stained the earth with perhaps more Christian blood than was shed during all the persecutions of the Early Church? If it does not act, it is because it assumes that its constituents do not care. Have we cared? What voice, potent to compel protest, has spoken? If ever the challenge to speak and to help, or else forfeit the claim to be called a Christian nation, was made to a people, it was made, and is now being made, through the martyred, massacred Armenian Christians, by allies of civilised and Christianised nations of Europe, in the presence of silent and complacent America, neutral even to the cause of the Christ, whose Body we have witnessed tortured, without a word of protest in their defenceless helplessness.

The curse and the crime of such silent sanction rests upon the Church, made impotent by division, more, perhaps, than it does upon the

government of the nation, left without Christian guidance and a compelling Christian influence.

In spite of the dire failures of the Church, the Christ Spirit is still regnant in the Heavens, and waiting, with infinite patience, to become embodied and expressed in the life of the Church. He waits to lead the way. He needs a consecrated Body in which, and through which, to speak and to work His will to peace. This Body must be one. Some day it may be one in its organic and formal unity. This must bide the time till more humility of mind prevails, and when pride and prejudice are less rampant in the heart and mind ecclesiastic. For this the world in its present crisis cannot wait.

Has the world in its need the right to ask and to expect that the Christian Church in America, and all over the world, shall respond to its call out of the darkness and come to its aid? The S. O. S. call sounds over the seas through the storm and the darkness. Shall we

stand apart? Shall we be hindered by discussions as to the regularity of Orders, and the validity of Sacraments, by the kind of Baptism, and questions of Church government, from going with one clear voice, and with one united purpose, to speak, and to lead and to help? United in purpose; in desire; in the great consciousness of world mission; in a consecrated willingness to serve, the Christian Church could, in this day of her greatest opportunity, do much to lead America, and through America, help to lead the other nations of the earth.

Never before was the tragedy of disunion in the Church more appalling than to-day as she stands almost impotent in the presence of the great catastrophe of the nations. To remain out of co-operative unity in the face of this call, imperious and appealing, which comes to her for moral and spiritual leadership; to remain impotent to speak with one consent, when the day comes for international reconstruction, and the creation of new world ideals, will be crim-

inal, and desperately faithless to her divinely given mission.

WHY THE CHURCH IS NOT READY

It is worth while that we should pause, in the face of this vital call, which comes in the presence of the world's tragedy, and, in the dawn of the world's crisis of reconstruction, to consider how it has come to pass that the Church has failed so largely, and why, in the face of her greatest opportunity, she stands to-day divided, and seemingly impotent for the world task and responsibility, which she should, for every reason, assume. She cannot lead because she is divided. And why is she divided? What processes of mind have led her into the tragedies of her failures, and into her present impotence to lead the thought of the world, and to determine the international idealism of the future?

As we review these processes of thought and attitudes of mind, it would be well to keep two questions constantly before our judgment.

First: Cannot the reasons for our organic disunion be surmounted for the sake of a spiritual unity of service and co-operation, and a solidarity of spiritual leadership in the presence of the crisis that faces us?

Second: Can we not, as we serve together, cultivate a spirit of sympathy and understanding that will create an atmosphere in which we may candidly confer and co-labour in an effort to create a comprehensive Church, inclusive and truly catholic in its divine life and spirit, and in its outlook towards ultimate organic unity?

CHAPTER II

THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH TO IMPERILLED AMERICA

A NATION is often unconscious of its real imminent perils until it is too late to avert them. They are generally inherent in the life of the nation itself. In ways that are insidious, and by the working of forces which blur the vision, and dull the national consciousness, these perils make their approach, and win their grip upon national life and character. The chief peril is that which comes of forgetfulness. It has ever been the fore-runner of disaster.

"Beware," wrote the inspired writer to ancient Israel, "Beware that ye forget not the Lord thy God." The temptation will come with

the increase of silver and gold. It will creep upon you in your hours of ease. It will assail you in the days of your luxury and pleasure. It will steal upon you in your consciousness of your prosperity. In that day, "Beware lest thou forget."

The peril lies in the temptation to materialism. Things take the place of God. In the process of treasure gathering, the needs and the values of the soul are lost sight of. Gradually the sight of the soul is lost. The senses become dominant in their appeal, and fasten consciousness, and hope and desire and the will upon the things that are seen, and faith, unused, becomes atrophied. In the process of gaining the world the soul is lost. It is a gradual process. Few men sell their birthright at the first sight of the mess of pottage. They do not sell out until hunger has grown very strong and imperious. The hunger for gold, for fame, for success, fed by the call and the cost and the intoxication of high living, make the sensual appeal that materialises the standards of char-

acter building. Honour, and truth, and the square deal are imperilled in the presence of this ravenous sense of hunger. Virtue is blinded, and standards are relaxed in the presence of the dominating lure of pleasure; and souls fall in the inevitable rebound from overstimulated senses, and overtaxed nerves. America is imperilled by the immorality which grows out of fatigue, and from the weariness of pursuit after false gods.

One is not unmindful of the splendid intellectual, moral, and spiritual achievements which have characterised our nation and people. There are many signs that by very many God is not forgotten.

When, however, the contributions made to the Glory of God and the public good are analysed, it is found that generosity of spirit is the characteristic of a very small minority of the people; and that those also are in the minority who consider life a stewardship, and time an opportunity for lending to others the helping hand.

To-day, as of old, to the great masses that go by absorbed in selfish unconcern of their brothers' need, the question is asked, "Is it nothing to you all ye that pass by?" Is it nothing to you that class distinctions are growing more intense, and that gulfs, unbridged by understanding and sympathy, are widening between man and man? Is it nothing to you that materialism is gripping the souls of men and throttling the spirit of brotherhood? Is it nothing to you that great, ill-gotten wealth engenders great hatred, and that men are combining in industrial war against each other and are too blind to see that their interests are common interests, and that, in the end, capital and labour must stand together, or fall together in a fight where neither one can win a lasting triumph over the other? Is it nothing to you that prejudice and bitterness are engendered between man and man, and between class and class, because material interests are hardening the hearts of men, and blinding their minds so that they cannot see afar off?

If they could see, they would look backwards. They would there perceive ambition and selfishness and greed and covetousness, prejudice, passion, hatred, and revenge, armed with clubs, then with iron, then with powder, and then with dynamite and poison gases, and aircraft and all the implements of hell. If they could see, they would look backward and behold the corpse-strewn battle fields of the world. Bones bleached white and blood and carnage would tell of man's inhumanity to man when love and brotherhood had become dominated by the will to power inflamed by the greed for material possession.

If we could see, we would look forward. There on the fields of the future, we would see the forces, born from the forgetfulness of God, armed, as they always, in the end, do arm themselves for a deathly grip, and a ghastly struggle. There is no permanent coherence in the forces which battle for dominance in the struggle for material supremacy. They are forces at enmity with each other. They set man

against man. They have always ended in war. By what reason, and for what cause, shall America be exempt?

Every war which has been fought on this continent has had its origin in some question growing out of property rights. As one to-day feels the pulse of public life, are there signs that this malignant fever has been entirely cured? As one to-day endeavours to diagnose the health of the body politic, are there no signs that give warning of a great heat of blood and passion, and of the presence of forces disordered and poisonous, which may, if unchecked and unhealed, produce a great eruption? By what token may America hope to be exempt from the consequences that have always followed from forgetting God?

The catastrophe may not immediately come. It may never come. If it does not, it will be because we have learned a lesson from looking over the seas, and from listening to the voices which come to us from the battles born out of the will bent on material power. The battle

does not of necessity have to be between nation and nation, or between section and section. The most dire struggles are sometimes the ones which arise among those who had given them the chance to be brothers and became enemies.

Is there no mediator? Surely this is the mission of the Christian Church. This is the day of her opportunity. To-day she can point to the power and the brutality of the forces engendered out of materialism. To-day she can show the inevitable end of selfish ambition by pointing to the carnage and torture and devastation of the battle fields covered with men fresh slain. To-day she can call men to pause, and ask them to consider the price being paid by their customers for those things from which we are hoarding gain. The dollars which come to us blood-stained and tear-stained,—shall we take them? It seems inevitable. It seems necessary that we should. We have what they must have, and what, in the light of all previous standards, they have the right to pur-

chase and to transport, if they can. American business men cannot be justly charged by any nation now at war as doing injustice in supplying the demand of those who, not having prepared for war, must prepare themselves now or be conquered by those who prepared before the war began by purchasing what they had need of in the markets of the world.

The Church has a mission, however, in view of these millions of dollars that are being paid for the means with which to kill millions of men.

Europe to-day is stretching to us appealing hands. Her sick and wounded are calling to us. We hear them in the stillness of the night. Above the music of the festive dance, we hear them calling. Over the noise of laughter from around the costly banquet board, we hear them calling. Above the applause of the opera house and theatre, we hear voices calling from afar. They sound above the din of industry, and above the roar of traffic. They cry "Come over and help us."

The papers tell of millions made from munition orders and of thousands given to hospital appeals. The mission of the Church is to arouse the American conscience to correct the proportion.

To-morrow the appeals will become more frequent, more numerous and more pathetic. There will come the cry of the widows and orphans of ten or more war-stricken nations. They will be asking for bread. They will be begging for clothing to protect them from the next winter's cold. They will point us to homes in ashes, and to brothers and fathers slain. They will tell us of children born of brutality. They will ask, "Is it nothing to you?"

The mission of the Church is to prepare the heart of America to generous and sacrificial response. If ever, since the merciful Christ set His Church to be His witness in the world, there was need for prayers for a divine benediction of power, this is surely the time for such intercession. If the Church should fail, if America should fail, it will be because the forces of

materialism have so gripped her mind and atrophied her heart that they will be prophetic of her own certain doom. If it should prove, in that coming day of opportunity and of judgment, that greed and selfishness so dominate our national life as to make us stingy and ungenerous in our response to these cries that are now coming, and are sure to come with a more pitiable and appealing voice, then as surely as the forgotten God still lives, He will, through the very forces which have usurped His place in our national life, call us to the bitter judgment of blood. It will not be, it never has been, an arbitrary judgment, for God is Love. It will be the judgment of natural cause and effect. It will be the judgment of the sure and inviolate working of the laws of that natural and material realm in which those deliberately choose to live and die who forget God, and remove themselves from the government and control of His merciful and creative spiritual laws.

It requires no special and unique prophetic gift to enable the Church to fulfill her mission,

which is to tell men this: It requires only a knowledge of history, and a plain understanding of the clear revelation which He has given of the ways in which natural and material forces always work in that darkness which comes when man forgets God and turns to worship and seek and serve things visible, material and soul-enslaving.

The Church cannot fulfill this mission to which she is called in this crisis of the world if she herself is fettered by formalism, manacled by materialism, and made impotent to speak and serve by reason of disunion.

She must make a supreme sacrifice before she can ask it of others with appealing power. She must come to the altar of consecration and sacrifice her "pride and prejudice and whatsoever else may hinder her from godly union and concord." She must not bide the time till academic interpretations, and theory differences, and uncertain and non-essential dogma barriers have been settled by schoolmen, and cleared away by lengthy investigation and discus-

sion. This great business of the King requires haste.

Sometimes the best way to make haste is to pause in the silence and take inventory. If we must go on a swift, far mission, we may well store away our impedimenta. We may also wisely, for the time being, label and put aside in safety vaults many of our long-cherished treasures. Among these may be some of the questions concerning our orders and Church government. We can return to them afterward. Orders, sacraments, a great consciousness of mission, a supreme confidence in Christ, and a larger trust in our brother Christian missioner, we need to take with us. The theories, interpretations, the exclusive claims, which divide us, and tend to keep us from service mobilisation in the emergency call, must be deposited for safe keeping until some of the vital world problems have been solved, as they cannot be solved without the united purpose and concerted voice, and without the will to serve made one in Christ.

That some may be aided in making sacrificial

response to this clear call of Christ to His whole Church, what is written in the pages following is presented with the earnest hope that the purpose in the heart of the writer will be taken as an excuse and apology for what may, through mental limitation, be said amiss, in the effort made to examine some of the causes of disunion, and in the further effort to point to the impelling and appealing need for a closer and more vital Christian co-operation, that with a common purpose we may enable the Church of God in America to guide and help America to guide and help the other nations of the earth.

CHAPTER III

MATERIALISM

THE dominating power of materialism is evident in every realm of thought and experience. Materialism may be defined as the affirmation of matter, and the forces which proceed from matter, and the energies directed toward material aggrandisement, as being the sole substance and source of power, causation, and of creative and constructive energy in the universe. It is the denial of a vital and conscious force or personality, creative and constructive in its operation, in the world and in the life of man. It is the denial of any immaterial part in man or in the universe. It is the doctrine of causation and of desire and will, which is opposed to *spiritism.*

The materialist is one whose desires, ambitions, energies and will are directed toward the attainment of material things alone, or who asserts and teaches that physical domination by physical force is the destined end of man and of nations.

This concept of the universe and of man is the basis of widely diffused and accepted systems of philosophy, religion, ethics and politics. It has become the dominating practical philosophy of the major part of current commercialism, and of international, political and diplomatic procedure. It is this concept which has expressed itself in the creation and upbuilding of that product which the pride and blindness of the workmen have named civilisation.

This is the dominating philosophical and ethical concept which lies back of the great world war, and which is the cause of it. In one nation, at least, there is found the candour which confesses it. There, in the most dominating class in the great social and governmental fabric, "the will to power" has been openly as-

serted as being the end of national ambition, and the means to this end. That has been asserted as being moral which aids in the attainment of this end. Whatever is prejudicial to the material growth and power and force of empire is immoral. Nietzsche taught that the Christian religion was the most immoral of all religions because it inculcated sympathy and a love for one's enemies, which tended to restrain "the will to power," and to thwart the ambition to make the empire with its culture idea dominant over the rest of mankind. There were many who were disposed to think that this philosophy was but the expression of a distorted mind which gave vent to its final materialistic ravings in the insane asylum of Jena, until evidence was given in Belgium, and elsewhere, that the philosophy that the end justified the means seemed dominant in the war councils of the German Empire. Of course, the end not yet having been attained and realised, it may be impossible, from the viewpoint of the materialist, to judge as to the moral value

of the means. Those, however, whose theories of morals and of humanity have another basis, and whose philosophy includes the Master's law of love and brotherhood, do not have to wait until this system finds its "place in the sun" before they pronounce judgment. They feel convinced that the fundamental error and inherent falseness of this philosophy is made clearly manifest in its methods of procedure, entirely regardless of what the distant end attained may be ultimately shown to be.

This philosophical concept finds its expression in "The Struggle for Law," by Jhering, who seeks to substantiate the contention that in force alone is to be found the basis and reason for law, and that law has won its place in society through the process of self-defence and self-assertion.

That this materialistic philosophy has not been thus publicly and officially accepted by other so-called civilised nations does not hide from view the fact that other nations engaged in that hideous war have sought their power

and attained their material greatness by following ambitions, and using means no less materialistic than those disseminated in German philosophical and ethical writings, and openly avowed and contended for by the German army. Nor are signs lacking to show that the grip of this philosophical and ethical materialism is fixed with fierce tenacity upon the heart and mind of American civilisation.

It is, of course, possible to assent to the fact that, in the consciousness of the nations engaged in war, there may exist, and doubtless does exist, a certain culture or altruistic idealism which it is sought to establish ultimately in the nation and on the earth. This intention may indeed exist in the national consciousness just as in the individual there may exist the intention of devoting large contributions of ill-gotten wealth to the cause of culture and toward the alleviation of human misery. There is, however, a growing sense of conviction in the social, civic and national consciousness that this intention proclaimed by an individual does

not constitute any moral justification for conducting sweat shops, and prostituting childhood to industrial accomplishment, or for oppressing the hireling in his wages. Nor does it justify the socialist in seeking to confiscate private property, or the anarchist in seeking to destroy it, because of some dream of a far-off social betterment, which may be by these methods secured. There is good reason to fear and to expect that the character formed during the process of seeking, by brutal means, the will to power will not be the kind and quality of individual or national character whose dominance would ever tend to conduce to true culture of soul, or to the permanent enrichment and elevation of human life. The sincerity of the ultimate intention may be fairly judged by the nature and kind of means used and justified to secure its final expression.

Before the coming of the Christ, there had grown up in Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Rome and Greece great material empires where wealth, power, pleasure and sensuality were

dominant, and where materialism was regnant. One by one these empires declined and fell into disintegration and destruction.

Then there came the One long promised and long expected. He stood in the midst of His people with a body clothed in the garb of a workman, and proclaimed the great spiritual background of human life. He spake as never man spake. He lived as never man had lived. He gave to life new terms of value and new standards of measurement. Blinded by materialism, poisoned by ambitions for worldly power, His people knew Him not. With a materially blinded mind they judged Him. With a materialistic prejudice they rejected Him. With a hatred engendered by the bigotry born and nurtured under a materialised ecclesiasticism they crucified Him.

Then there dawned upon those who had heard Him, and followed Him, and who heard Him again speaking the great Gospel of a great, conquering love, which the powers of hate and death had failed to suppress, a clearer vision

of Him, and of life and its meaning and purpose revealed in Him who had been called through death to live as King of life and truth and love.

With the vision of His cross, and in the power of His resurrection life, His Church went forth to sacrifice and to win dominion over the hearts and wills of men. Persecuted by the forces of materialism, relying upon the promise and presence of Him Who, unseen, dwelt among them, and whose Spirit dwelt within, the Church gave her witness to the world of her unconquerable faith.

Then, in the presence of the forces and symbols of imperial materialism, the Church began to lose her clear vision power. She drew near to the outstretched arm of empire, and began to lean upon the arm of flesh. Then she appropriated this arm, and the sword that was in the hand of it. Then, to the forces of materialism, there was added the materialised Church.

Golden, gilded, and dominantly imperious, she asserted her will to power, and with the

sword she had seized, she sought to enforce her decrees.

Still, however, there lingered a light which never deserted the lamp, though at times it flickered and seemed almost to die away. Always there were faithful souls who ministered at the altar and fanned the waning flame through prayer and sacrificial devotion. Thus it happened, as Guizot asserts in his "History of European Civilisation," that, amid the darkness and corruption of mediæval Europe, the one ray of light was that which ever proceeded from the flame of truth and virtue which persisted in lingering in, and shining through, the Christian Church in spite of her own materialism and formality.

The student of ecclesiastical history is, however, fully aware of the fact that the Church soon became the very imperfect and grossly materialised representative of the simple spiritual character and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

CHAPTER IV

CIVILISATION

THAT which men call civilisation has been, and is still, often confused with Christianity. The two terms are in no sense synonymous. They are most largely and distinctly contrary, the one to the other. Indeed, civilisation, so called, has ever been, and is now, composed of far more barbaric than Christian elements. The struggle of God to manifest Himself through the Church has been marvellously patient and divinely persistent. Without the restraining and constructive power of the Spirit's witness and influence through the Church, it is impossible to tell to what depths of degradation humanity would have fallen.

It is quite impossible to determine what this

level would have been by pointing to the status of barbarian people. Among them we find the unorganised and undeveloped primitive human instincts, both of brutality and morality. In that state of society which we have denominated civilisation, we find these instincts and impulses developed and most highly organised.

Where this development has taken place under the guidance and direction of materialistic education; where that which is called education, without religious and spiritual inspiration and enrichment, has moulded the mind; where the end of education has been to train the mind to dominate matter and make a living, and win a fortune; where the cultivation of mental alertness and ingenuity has been pursued for the sake of amassing wealth and enjoying pleasure, and where knowledge, apart from the consideration of love and brotherhood, has been taught as being and giving power, it has come to pass that, as an inevitable result, a so-called civilisation has been built up which is indeed most largely a refined, organised and tremendously

potent development of barbarism. Civilisation without the restraints and compelling influences of spiritual life is more barbaric than primitive barbarism. Brutal forces, selfish instincts, and material ambitions, organised and directed by a keen mind, correlated and incorporated by shrewd mentality, used in the pursuit of personal or national selfishness, by thought and desire and will, which have been educated to be efficient, but which have not been trained to recognise and respect the rights of others, may be named civilisation, but the name does not make the product other than it is in fact, namely, a gigantic, organised system of brutal barbarism. The civilisation which is inherently materialised, rationalised, and made mentally potent and dominant, has no claim whatsoever to be called or considered Christian civilisation. It would be as justifiable to speak of a sunlit night.

It was because his own materialism had so blinded his vision that Herbert Spencer failed to see this, and, therefore, argued against Chris-

tianity, seeking to prove his contention by pointing to the elemental virtues of barbarian people, and comparing what he saw there with the debauchery, sensuality, murder, lust and cruelty of "Christian civilisation." He failed to see that a vast proportion of that which he called Christian civilisation is refined and organised materialistic barbarism. He failed to see that the very system which he compares with barbarism is, because of its materialism, the deadliest foe to the progress and incarnation in humanity of the spirit of Christ. He failed to see that the only fair comparison would be between the best barbarian and Jesus Christ, or between the highest ideals of barbarian tribes and the spiritual idealism of the Gospel of Christ. He failed, as we often fail, to see that Christ and the Christ spirit are not synonymous with the ecclesiastical organisation, which, at times, is so materialistic that it hides from view the simple truth proclaimed as essential to salvation in the great Gospel of redemption. While, in many ways, Christianity has put a saving heart

and hope into civilisation, yet in deed and in truth, civilisation, so called, is, and has generally been, the material god who blinds men's eyes and deadens their ears, so that they neither see nor hear the great nearby God, and they fail to know the Christ who, unseen and rejected, stands among us crowned with thorns.

Time and time again, the priests of His religion have been so absorbed in building the material temple, and manipulating and defending the organisation, and have been so engaged in intrenching themselves behind their inherited and vested rights, and defending themselves against encroachments upon their exclusive claims, that the Church, which was sent to be the witness of the Spirit, and to protest against the dominance of materialism, became herself a part of a great materialistic system, in which the very priests of Christianity aided, by their false emphasis, in putting Christ to open shame before the minds of men who, like Herbert Spencer, judge Christ's religion by the gross

and petty materialistic and formalistic expressions of distorted ecclesiasticism.

It is, however, to be remembered that the failure is not wholly, if indeed it is chiefly, chargeable to the Church. She has much through which to make her message penetrate. The indifference engendered by wealth and luxury and comfort, the neglect of soul culture resulting from the ceaseless pursuit of material things, the willingness, the supreme determination to gain the world regardless of the loss of the soul, makes it extremely hard for the Church, with a spiritual intent and purpose, to find a point of contact between human interest and spiritual truth. It is to be borne in mind that, when the Christ Himself stood among men, they heard Him not, saw Him not, and knew Him not. The Church should be very much in earnest, and deeply conscious of the necessity of being vitally spiritual, but if she would not lose courage, she must pray for a divine quality of patience and perseverance.

Is it to be wondered at that, when her pearls

are rejected and trampled under foot by civilised barbarians, she should turn with some enthusiasm of hope to the more elemental and less materialised barbarian people and seek to show the power of her divine mission in her contact with the primitive child-like honesty and trust and obedience of the uncivilised heathen?

It is not hard to understand the enthusiasm of Bishop Tucker of Uganda, who returned to London aglow with the joy of the wonderful witness given by his people to the sincerity of their simple faith in Christ. One could but feel as one listened to the recital of the tokens of this people's sacrificial devotion, that to them the revelation of Christ had meant everything, and had led them to enthrone Him as King supreme over their lives.

Except for the danger of being devoured by cannibals, the missionary to the dwellers in the palatial homes of our so-called civilised lands has a far harder task than the missionary to more primitive barbarian people. He has a less hard and less thick outer surface through which

to penetrate than does he who has to speak to the gold-encrusted souls atrophied by luxury, living amid the volatile, sublimated and insidious influences of refined barbarism, and sensualised materialism. The inspiration which comes to him who has the courage to persist in seeking to penetrate this hardened crust of modern materialism, comes largely from the fact that those who come out of this environment come with souls made strong from having broken heavy and gross chains. The cost of emancipation, and the terrible struggle to be free, is that which gives to the real Christian in the midst of modern materialistic civilisation his splendid and far-reaching power of influence. Those who know the downward pull of so-called civilisation know and appreciate what it has cost to climb. The soul made free comes to-day into the glory of the life redeemed through great tribulation.

The superficial nature of materialistic thought is observed also in the judgment pronounced against the wisdom of the Church in

"sending missionaries to disturb the primitive simplicity of life found among many barbarian people." Here again it is not noted that what disturbs and distorts and spoils their life is not the simple truth revealed by the missionary that goes to tell them of God's great love revealed in Jesus Christ, but the vices and distortions of materialised civilisation, which pushes in through the door opened by the missionary, and which would be opened and entered by commercialism even though the missionary were not the pioneer.

Before a fair tribunal, Christianity will never be judged by the collapse of the civilisation which has collapsed because of the presence and growth of materialism which repudiated the Christian contention, and refused to hear and heed the Gospel of sacrificial renunciation, or to follow Christ in His call and leadership into a life of simple faith, of simple love and of trustful obedience and self-forgetful service.

Prefixing the word Christian to civilisation

may produce confusion of thought, but doing so does not produce Christian character. This comes to men and nations through a process of cross bearing and crucifixion, which the Christian Church has not yet succeeded in leading civilisation to consent to accept, and which the Church, at times, has failed to teach by the power of her own example.

That men may be turned from sacrificing others to the sacrifice of themselves for others; that civilisation, so refined and skilled in its barbarism, may be made indeed Christian, is the gigantic task of the Christian Church. The god of this world, the barbarian's god, must be dethroned, and Christ must be crowned King of kings and Lord of lords.

The Church, in order to fulfill her mission to materialised civilisation, must renounce the world and the flesh before she can denounce the vain pomps and glories and sensual enticements of materialism. The chains which bind the world cannot be broken by human might or human power, but by the "All Power" prom-

ised by Christ to His Church, but which she has never adequately appropriated.

Materialism awaits its Master Who will come with conquering power in the day dawn of a great and simple faith which worketh by love.

CHAPTER V

THE SPIRITUAL MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

KNOWING what was in man, and knowing what was in the world that would appeal to man, and enslave him, unless he was prepared to resist, the Christ constituted His Church to be the witness of the Spirit, and promised, through His Church, to give His Spirit that men might know the truth that would enable them to overcome the world with its material and sensual appeal.

He gave to the Church the inspiration of His own life in its relation to materialism. Knowing that men would question as to the origin and destiny of the soul, He said, "I came forth from God." "I go to the Father." He said

of His mission, "The Father hath sent me." The purpose for which He was sent He said was "to give eternal life" to men that they too, who had come from God, might return to Him with lives enriched through contact with God in their pilgrimage through things material.

In coming into the world, He chose to come simply. The manger was His cradle. His home was a workman's cottage. His boyhood was spent at the carpenter's bench, in the open fields, and in the streets of an humble village. His public ministry began in the light which came from the open heavens as He prayed. He passed into the solitude of the wilderness. There He was tempted by the god of this world who sought to attach Him to the material system. Before Him passed in review the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. And He asked, shall I accept and seek to use these powers of materialism as means for building up the Kingdom of God? He considered the terms upon which they were offered, and determined that He would rather suffer and be free. From

the wilderness He came to serve men. He went about doing good. He had not where to lay His head. One day the multitude came and would have crowned Him King. He refused the crown, and went apart into a solitary place to commune with God. Out of the silence He came and spake with authority, "as never man spake."

He selected chosen witnesses to be with Him, and, drawing them aside by the quiet lake, or into the mountain solitude, He taught them. He told them not to depend on things material. They were to seek first the Kingdom of God. They were not to lay up for themselves treasures upon earth. For their means of power they were to go often into the solitary place. They were unlearned and ignorant men, and poor. He gave them a simple and beautiful Gospel. It passed into their hearts. It lingered there. Afterward, when some of them came to write, they remembered how very simply He had talked to those whom He met by the wayside. They recalled how He turned their minds

away from rational speculation and left them questioning in the presence of mystery. They recalled how He ever penetrated through ritual observance, and dwelt upon the spiritual truth which lay as the background of phenomena. They told how He made the lilies, and fields, and the vineyards and the fishermen's nets, and the seed sown by the husbandmen and other incidents of the commonplace, sacramental of the great truths of the Kingdom of God. They told how He took them into an upper room and gave them there the greater sacrament of His own life and death, and recalled His intercessory prayer, and His parting promise of a Spirit who should come to guide them into all truth. They recalled the agony of prayer in Gethsemane, and filled priceless pages with the simple record of His passing on to Calvary. They tell us that they did not understand. They paint the gloom which enveloped them without His presence. Then the pages glow with celestial light, and from them ring the glad notes of triumph.

Again He walks with them, but they know Him not, for they are reasoning with Him, and with each other, by the way. The silence comes. The stars appear. He takes bread and breaks it, and as He speaks, they know Him. Then, as their minds begin to wonder and to try to understand, He vanishes, to come again into their midst in the silence of the morning as they sit by the lake. They tell how He led them up into a mountain and commissioned them to go teach and incorporate men into His Body through Baptism. He had already told them to break the bread in remembrance of His broken Body, and to drink of the cup in remembrance of His blood outpoured. He does not, in His parting commission, re-emphasise this. He lifts His hands in blessing and becomes invisible among them.

All these things and many others they remembered, and, that His Church might know its Lord and follow Him, they wrote these things down to be the heritage of the Christian Church, its character and foundation. They

preached to others what they had seen and heard and known, and then passed into the world invisible, leaving others to be His witnesses.

There is no complex system, and no tinge of materialism in the story given. The great love of God for man stands clearly revealed in His incarnation, and the heart of the Christ is, in the Gospels, thrown open to the world, and all are asked to come and be of His Body who will come in simple faith, and follow in the path of simple obedience bearing their cross, and giving their witness.

Surely it has not been because of Him or His teaching that civilisation has grown materialistic, and greedy, and full of lust and ambition, and has become dominated by the will to power. Surely He did not give the inspiration which led to the battles of the schoolmen, or to the doctrine of temporal power, for "my Kingdom," He said, "is not of this world." Surely He cannot be held responsible for the spirit of materialism, and of formalism, and of exclusive

logical interpretation which crept in and dominated the Church. Surely the Church is gravely responsible if, in the light of His life, she puts the emphasis upon the wrong things, or puts upon rightful things a wrong and disproportionate emphasis.

The great crisis has come. Shall not the Church pause and take inventory? The methods, the emphasis, the organisation, the theories, which have dominated her life have failed to stem the tide of materialism. It has deluged civilisation. It has throttled the human heart. It has atrophied human sensibilities. The cries of widows and orphans turn neither kaiser nor king from the determination to kill as long as men and money remain.

Is it not very probable that something is really desperately wrong in the past and present programme of the Church? It is easy and costless to lay the blame upon others. It is quite possible to charge the impotence of the Church to the schism of others, and forget the arrogance and bigotry that caused them to seek

spiritual freedom. It is easy to lay the imputation of disloyalty to others who failed to see the truth as we formulated it, unmindful of the fact that we may have formulated theories in the past to which we ourselves would not to-day subscribe. It is easy to blame those who departed from confessions of faith and articles of religion in days long gone, forgetful that to-day these articles and confessions are by ourselves side-tracked or repudiated. Shall we repudiate those who rejected in other days what to-day we reject? That it is *we* who reject the articles and confessions to-day does not prove that they were any more infallibly true when they were by others rejected because their consciences could not, in days gone by, give to these iron-clad tests of faith the assent of candid and honest minds which to-day we cannot give.

Is it not quite possible that, by magnifying at one time the indispensable value of interpretations and theories afterward by us repudiated, and by insisting upon contentions and dogmas that to many thousands of spiritual

men are not regarded as essential to salvation, that the Church has made and is making the impression upon the world that she has lost the consciousness of her mission to witness to Christ, and to the simple faith and glorious redeeming love proclaimed in the simple message of His Gospel? At times the Church seems panic-stricken. She impresses the world with the idea that she has lost confidence in herself. Around some ancient bulwark of logical interpretation, behind some fort of catholic sanction, she intrenches herself. To the world she says, If this falls, I fall. The world wonders just why this logical deduction is after all essential to its salvation. It comes to question the truth of the claim that this defended bulwark is the critical salient which must be held in order to enable the Church to solve the problems arising out of the world crisis.

Men, in larger numbers than ever before, are gathering in their clubs and discussing the relation of the Church to the world crisis. They are asking why is she fighting over shibboleths?

They are asking why is the lack of fellowship and co-operation with such stupendous, vital problems to be solved? They are taking down books which they have not been accustomed to read, and, as they turn the pages which tell of Bloody Articles, and test interpretations, and scientific and religious controversies, and baptismal regeneration, and predestination, and eternal punishment, and heathen damnation contentions, which made heaven and earth lurid with the fires of heated debates, the men who think are asking "How long, O Lord, how long" will the ecclesiastical mind persist in contending for theories and interpretations which are not essential to salvation, and which keep men from co-operating in this day of the world's crisis and of the Church's greatest opportunity?

These questions are being asked. They are reasonable questions and fair. The men who ask them are coming to see that it is rationalism and materialism which has collapsed in this crisis of human history. They are coming to see, and are beginning already to say that the

Church, having failed to make her witness to the spiritual heard and heeded by men and nations, stands to-day before the judgment bar of God and of man. What will she plead? What will she confess? What will she determine?

One can but wonder what the Master is trying to say to His Church to-day. Unseen He walks in our midst. He needs a vital, consecrated Body through which to express and reveal Himself to the world. He needs a human tongue through which to speak, and human hands with which to heal and help. Through materialism He cannot speak. Through His Church materialised, He cannot speak to materialism. By our failure to perceive and know and understand, we leave Him voiceless. By our divisions we leave Him almost impotent to help. By our pride and conceit and stubbornness, we leave Him filled with a sorrow which is unutterable.

In this time of crisis we hear Him say, "Lo I come." But can we hear Him say, "A Body hast thou prepared for me?" He needs a Body

presented as a living sacrifice and, through sacrifice, made one in spirit and in truth. He needs the human mind transformed by the renewing of the spirit. He needs a great human heart consecrated to love. He needs a Body which shall be the living temple of His living spirit. He will make it one, if it is ever thus presented to Him.

It may be that the great world crisis will compel His Church to bear its cross and follow Him over Calvary to unity. When she can say, "I am crucified with Christ," then, but not till then, will the world hear the voice of Him who is waiting and longing to speak His message of peace and love and power, that the Father's children may all be made brothers.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRAGEDY OF UNPREPAREDNESS*

WE cannot to-day do the things that we would. The impulses, the desires, even the will to serve stand almost impotent in the presence of a world catastrophe. We have organised and systematised the will to material gain and worldly power. The instruments of production, the means for transportation, the methods for transacting the work of the world, are unified and correlated and are almost perfect in their efficiency. Secular education has been graded and made adaptable to every need of man save the needs of the soul. We have systematised our theology. Doctrine

* This chapter was used as a part of an address made to the Laymen's Missionary Convention, in New York City, April 10th, 1916.

follows doctrine in ordered and logical sequence in our scholarly books on dogmatics. Our liturgy is as harmonious and beautiful as a poem, and our churches are, in many instances, poems in stone.

For a year and a half the cry of the world's need has swept over the ocean to America, and we have found no way to make anything which approaches or suggests an adequate response. Individuals, here and there, have given generously. Individuals, in many instances, have trained souls. As a people we have done nothing and attempted nothing. We stand idle and impotent.

The impulses and desires of selfishness are organised. The heart of our humanity is in a state of moral and spiritual chaos. There is no voice which speaks with a spiritual authority to the national conscience, and no means have been provided for gathering together the latent forces of unselfishness, of generosity, of kindness and benevolence which exist unorganised and unexpressed in the heart of the American

people. The masses are exploited by organised selfishness. The masses are, to a great extent, organised for selfish exploitation. The masses of our American people are, however, to-day missing the greatest opportunity which ever came to a people of any nation to be made conscious of the duties and responsibilities of human brotherhood. The opportunity for creating a sense of moral and spiritual solidarity is offered, as it was never before offered to a people, and so far absolutely nothing commensurate with the opportunity has been attempted.

The nation cannot pass through this crisis and, in the end, be left upon the moral plane where she stood at the beginning of the world war. She must of necessity either ascend or descend morally and spiritually. The law to which Bishop Butler called attention, that the human mind and heart are atrophied and debased by feeling emotions which are unexpressed, is immutable. America is beginning to get accustomed to the cry of need and to the

sight of appealing tragedy to which she makes no adequate effort to respond. We are in danger of measuring our generosity by the number of appeals we hear, and the strength of the emotions we have felt, rather than by the sacrifices we have actually made to help the world's great need. Unless the national conscience is aroused to a point that will lead the national will to make a sacrificial response, America will, in the end, have been hardened and debased by having viewed with irresponsive selfishness the sorrow and need of her suffering brothers beyond the seas.

The spectacle is pathetic and appalling. It is pathetic because it gives evidence of the impotence of the institutions and forces which should naturally voice and express and work in this crisis the will of God. An unprepared Church stands in the presence of a world crisis. Among all her age-long systems, there is not found to-day one that is adequate for leadership, and for a constructive and statesmanlike programme of correlating and making operative

the divine impulses in the heart of the people.

It is appalling because of the fact that among all the nations upon earth to-day America most largely needs to seize and make use of the opportunity to consolidate the moral and spiritual impulses of her people. She, of all others, preeminently needs to create and develop the forces of a higher national unity. This need is preeminently hers because of the heterogeneous and hyphenated nature of her population. From every nation under the sun, people have flocked to her shores bringing with them various impelling ideals and impulses. Should the time ever come when the nation will be called to act as a unit, there will then be made apparent the appalling tragedy of not having used the opportunity which these hours afford for binding the people into a common purpose in a united effort to serve the needs of others. From America's view-point, the success of this effort would not be measured by the sums of money contributed but by the number of those who, in response to a clear call, would unite to serve

others. This union of a noble intent, this solidarity of moral and spiritual purpose, would give to America her most efficient and potent preparedness in the event of either peace or war.

What doth it profit a nation if it gains treasures from the whole world's need, and in response to the cry of the world's deepest need, turns an irresponsive ear, and listens with a deadened soul? What will it profit this nation if it organises its mind and its will to gain, and through a great national indifference, selfishness and impotence, dies at last of a degenerated and poisoned heart?

To-day the mind of the nation is fixed upon force. It is counting its ships, its guns, its forts, and its soldiers. It is counting its dollars. The nation is weighing itself. The nation needs to do this. But in this alone the nation will not find its preparedness. In these things, when taken alone, are found the seeds of a nation's doom. Unless a nation be possessed of spiritual treasures worth saving, and worthy to

be given, she cumbers the earth, and impedes the onward march of God. Of such nations it is written in the book of destiny that their days are numbered because, when weighed in the balance of God's unrelenting judgment, they are found to be lacking in the elements essential to personal and national permanence.

The Christian Church stands to-day in the presence of organised greed, covetousness and materialism in national life made incoherent because of its unorganised soul, and disorganised moral and spiritual impulses. The Christian Church stands in the presence of this crisis herself disorganised, and, in some instances, contentious over interpretations, and fighting over shibboleths.

She claims to be the Body of Christ. She is His Body. But her chains are not His. They bind Him. They throttle Him. They make it possible for the world to crucify Him afresh. As of old, His cross was set up by Cæsar, but his chains were forged by orthodoxy made blind by pride and prejudice. Sometimes it would

seem that the Church loved the chains forged by its own logic better than she loved the Body of His humiliation and sacrifice. Sometimes it would seem that the Church had become obsessed with the idea that she was called to manufacture unity by building up a logical system and creating a form and mould in which, because of its antiquity and symmetry, the Spirit of unity must of necessity dwell, forgetting that God has ever built for Himself in the world, and in man, a Body as it has pleased Him, when His Spirit was allowed to have free course, that He might glorify and unify the Body by working from within the consecrated shrine of His own chosen dwelling place.

The crisis calls us to set Christ free. In this hour we should pray for vision to discriminate very clearly between ecclesiastical shackles and the flesh and blood of His living Body. The chains which delimit the freedom of His Spirit, and make it possible for the world to crucify afresh its Lord of life, must be stricken from His body. The world greatly needs Him.

America is slowly but consciously becoming enslaved because to-day there is no visible mediator, no one to speak to her conscience, no one to gather her children together, no one to enfold them in a great saving purpose to help the world's need, no one to save. And yet invisible He stands in His visible Church. Here to-day, as there in the long ago, He can do no mighty works because He is bound by our unbelief, shackled, as was the Word of God of old, by our traditions, and chained by the delimiting logical formalism and narrow dogmatism of schools of thought in Churches which seek to atone for their narrowness by prefixing to their Christian name terms which imply an exclusive orthodoxy.

The crisis calls us to re-examine the grounds upon which this Church bases its claim to exclusiveness. It calls every Church to look back over the path of its past life and note the processes of its departure from the ideal of spiritual and corporate unity. Above all things, the crisis calls for sacrifice. It pleads for unity in

spiritual purpose and in spiritual essentials. It points to millions scattered as sheep without a shepherd. It bids us listen to the clanking chains of materialism by which they are being fast bound and enslaved. It asks if we cannot voice the nation's need, the nation's hope, the world's pathetic cry, and call the impulses to help, which lie latent in the hearts of millions, into a united purpose, and into a rational expression of brotherliness. It asks for Christian co-operation. America's peril pleads for the inspiration which Christian unity of will and purpose would to-day give to the life of the nation.

The Church has not trained itself for such a service of giving as the world is trained for the purpose of getting. The means through which material ambition works its will have been created as a result of a continuity of consciousness and application with regard to selfish gain, and with reference to the relation of ambition to things material. The means for expressing the soul have not been created because of the

lack of continuity in our consciousness of our divine and human relationships. The spiritual emotions and aspirations have been either too exclusively personal, or else too evanescent to register themselves in a deep and abiding and constructive social and national spiritual conscience. The crisis, therefore, finds us unprepared. A sense of vague bewilderment dazes the mind as it endeavours to think out a way to unify and express the benevolent disposition and latent emotions which lie unexpressed in the heart of the masses of the American people. A feeling of hesitancy shackles the will to serve. The mind is dominated by the consciousness of our moral and spiritual unpreparedness. As a nation we are in grave danger of failing to do anything which will represent the national conscience because we fear that a great nation-wide endeavour could not be adequately voiced and expressed. It were, however, better for the nation to fail in a great spiritual undertaking, than to succeed in doing the small service which will result from the contribu-

tions made by a limited number of individuals who happen to be touched by special and spasmodic appeals. Though these gifts may be generous, and in some instances munificent, they do not represent the masses of the people, nor do they express the national consciousness, nor do they register the response of the national conscience.

The crisis imperatively demands that we endeavour, through a great sacrifice and consecration, to give to the Christ a voice through His Church that shall call the masses of our people into a unity of service to help supply the need of to-day and the greater needs which will voice themselves on the morrow.

If objection is made that gifts could not be made by America during the war to nations in need without releasing money in these nations for the uses of war; if it be objected that the distribution now, or during the war, of a national fund would arouse contention and animosity; then the crisis of to-day could be used as the inspiration of a national endeavour

to raise now and during the progress of the war a fund for helping to reconstruct and rehabilitate the people who will need many millions when the war is done to enable them to tie together again the broken cords of personal and national life.

A political platform is, in a few weeks, impelled into the consciousness of the American people. An appeal for armament preparedness is voiced through various and divergent institutions to the heart and mind of the nation. The appeal of God, which is the appeal of human need to the human heart, finds everything organised save the means to make that appeal heard, and to gather into one the willingness to help. The opportunity to unify the heart of the nation's life through a great endeavour to serve the world's need, the opportunity to unify the higher, the deeper consciousness of civic and national responsibility is the crisis opportunity of the Christian Church.

In every city, in every hamlet in America, those who know and love the merciful and

compassionate Christ should unite in some way to give voice to the heart of love and pity which to-day weeps over the tragedy of the world.

This endeavour might be launched by the Laymen's Missionary Movement and commended by them to the Federated Churches of Christ in America and extended to other organisations outside the Christian Church, or it might be started by the action of the General Convention or Assembly or Conference of some branch of the Christian Church, and co-operation asked from other branches of the Church.

The promise of Christ that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, implied a promise that His Church should some day prevail against the gates of hell. The Church, however, which in her pride boasts "I am rich and have need of nothing" may hear the Master say, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead; strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." "Remember whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly,

and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent."

The god of this world, and the God of Love, both are saying to America to-day, "Behold I have set before thee an open door." Through the door opened by the god of this world, the trains of commerce are rushing laden with munitions of war, and returning laden with gold. Through it, the organised forces of materialism are passing in serried ranks with their eyes fixed on the golden gain which lures them on.

Through the door opened by the God of Love comes the cry of millions in need. By this open door stands the divided, shackled Church, discussing ancient claims, contending for the right of precedence in the procession to minister to fast dying men, disputing as to the vestments to be worn in the funeral obsequies of nations, and as to the terms upon which souls, passing into the invisible beyond, are to be given the Bread of Life and the assurance of forgiveness.

It is time for the procession to pass through

the open door bearing the garnered gifts of millions in the slavery to selfishness to millions in need of medicine and daily bread. It will be time to stop longer and discuss the claims of the succession when the procession shall have returned from its mission through the open door to help bind up the bruised and bleeding heart of the nations.

Millions of our Father's children, naked and cold, sick and hungry, and dying faster than men have ever died before, stretch out to America appealing hands. Shall America make a national response? The nations, when the war is done, and a calmer judgment prevails, will recognise that comparatively few institutions and individuals in this country have made large profits from the war. They will perceive, what will doubtless be apparent, that as a nation our economic loss has been far greater than our economic gain. If in that day of judgment, when great hatreds and bitter resentments shall tend to pervert the judgment of the nations, it shall be recognised that, while individuals in

America have in many instances grown rich by reason of this world tragedy, that, nevertheless, the American people, in response to a nation-wide appeal, have shown a disposition to be brotherly and compassionate, then the judgment against the nation will be one of which we will not be ashamed. It will be a judgment like that held of America to-day in China as a result of the return of the Boxer indemnity fund.

This is the open door of opportunity set before the Church and the nation. What response will the Christian Church make? What capacity of leadership will she show? What sacrifices will she be willing to endure?

What will be the attitude of the Episcopal Church in this co-operative endeavour? The value of "the succession," which many emphasise as essential and restrictive, will be measured by many, if not by the Master, by the place it takes in the procession through the door opened by this crisis in the history of the world and in the life of the Church of God.

PART II

ECCLESIASTICISM AND CHRISTIANITY FORM AND SPIRIT

"The Body without the Spirit is dead."

"And they took Jesus and bound Him."

"Though we be tied and bound with the chain of our sins, yet let the pitifulness of thy great mercy loose us; for the honour of Jesus Christ."

CHAPTER VII

THE PURPOSE PREVIEWED

THROUGH the pages following, some of the processes of mind which have contributed to make the Christian Church unprepared to meet the crisis, and make use of her greatest opportunity, will be considered. The Church once for all time founded by the Christ, has become divided and encrusted and made incompetent for her world mission. She must of necessity face the task of readjustment and of reconstruction. She must be led to a new and higher point of view. She must follow her Master up to the mount of transfiguration, and talk with Him of the decease which she must accomplish on Calvary, if she would rise to the glory of communicating His resurrection life

and power to the world, which, through Him alone, can be saved.

She must examine the measure of her emphasis, and ask if it has always been placed upon things vital and essential. She must consider, in view of the call which comes to her through the open door, the grounds and claims which prevent co-operative endeavour, and withhold Christian communions from applying the potency of a vital common faith to the moral disorders of the world with a corporate solidarity of high moral and spiritual purpose. She would do well to remeasure and resurvey the bounds of her comprehensiveness, and question as to the extent of her inclusiveness of the purpose of God within the bounds of her exclusive claims. After all it is a question of balance, and of emphasis, and of a right judgment in all things. Before all is the necessity for prayer and penitence.

We have made mistakes. We have trusted the logic of our delimited minds, and have leaned too often upon the knowledge that puf-

feth up and produces pride and arrogance, rather than upon the love that buildeth up the Body of Christ. We have relied upon the arm of flesh, and trusted in things material. We have gendered controversies by the vain endeavour to dictate exactly how intellectual belief should accept the mystical union between the invisible Spirit and the form of its manifestation in Holy Baptism, in the Holy Communion, in Biblical inspiration, and Orders, and in the mystery of the Divine Incarnation and Resurrection. In every instance it has been the material, the human, the visible side, of the mystery that has mastered and perverted the mind. In every instance through theological and ecclesiastical controversy, intellectual belief in theories of interpretation has sought to supplant and usurp the place of simple faith which unites the personal soul of man with the personal Christ.

During the centuries through which she has passed, the Church has built barriers which have separated Christians from godly union and con-

cord. We live behind them. We cannot see each other. We do not understand each other. We distrust each other.

The world crisis calls us. We refuse to march together because of questions of precedence. We decline to co-operate because of a certain distrust in our position, because of a fear that a thing we claim as divine will be compromised by association with those who, in ways other than those we cherish, are following Christ, and serving the world in the power and witness of His Spirit. Ecclesiasticism must not be allowed to enchain the Christ.

In what shall be said, the purpose will always be to do respect to every honest conviction, and to recognise the sincerity of mind and heart of every seeker after truth. The saintliness of character seen in men of many and varied schools of thought, and in the various communions of the Church, gives evidence of a presence and power which is divine, which transcends the limits of logical barriers and ecclesiastical exclusiveness, and justifies the plea

which is made in the chapters which follow for a review of positions arrived at by the logical process, and for an inclusive and comprehensive Church, and for a co-operation of Christian people for upbuilding the spiritual order of the world.

The conviction is cherished that the divine order of the Church will not suffer from a co-operative endeavour to correct and cure the moral disorder of the world. Where Christ calls through the thousand-voiced needs of a world prostrate, impotent, dying in darkness, and crushed beneath the weight of collapsed materialism, we cannot suffer loss of anything essential to faith and order if we follow Him, in the company of others who also hear and make answer to His call and command to go teach the nations and baptise them with power that the kingdoms of this world may become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

As we note the confusion and discord, and consider the unhappy divisions which have re-

sulted from the effort to bound the comprehensiveness of faith, and the inclusiveness of the Church by the use of reason and the processes of logic; as we note the results of seeking to fix the limits of God's covenanted mercies by the conclusions of the finite mind; it becomes apparent that serious errors have been made which need to be corrected. The necessity for considering the relation between ecclesiasticism and Christianity becomes also apparent. And in view of our failure to find a way to visible organic unity by the use of the methods which have been pursued, the question arises: may it not be wise for the Church to begin to place the major emphasis upon the spirit, rather than upon the form, of unity, and seek to find and make use of the approaches to unity which start from the open door to closer fellowship, a better understanding, and a deeper sympathy? May it not be that the spirit of unity will come to live in us more largely, and build up the Body into visible organic unity in a way that shall please Him, if we begin to walk more closely

with others who follow Him in the effort to establish and extend the Kingdom of God, and to prepare the way for the rule and guidance of the Spirit of Life and Love and Unity?

CHAPTER VIII

LOGIC AND CATHOLICITY

HUMAN logic has proven a poor prop to the catholicity of the Church of God. It has been the chief instrument in promoting sectarianism and schism. By its aid, every proposition and dogma that has been set forth has been established to the satisfaction of those who stood sponsors for it. By it, definitions, inadequate to comprehend the truth, have been put forth, and the scope of truth and of divine life, in its expression and revelation, have been delimited. By it, God has been reasoned into tribal limits, and then, by the tribe, has been reasoned into the confines of the sect, then, by the sect, He has been reasoned out of the covenant relationship with the rest of mankind.

Logical bulwarks have ever been the defence of bigotry, exclusiveness and narrow sectarianism.

Men have ever been prone to forget that, as temples made with hands cannot contain Him, even so can He not be contained in, and circumscribed by, definitions and dogmas, or by the terms of ecclesiastical polity. He ever overflows the channels which men survey, map out, charter and proclaim as exclusive means through which the divine life is to be communicated. Beyond our fullest and most comprehensive thought, there is ever an unexpressed fulness of God. The Eternal One has persistently refused to be confined within the dogmas, terms and systems which, through the logical process, men have decreed in order to circumscribe His Grace, and through which they have sought to appropriate to themselves an exclusive claim to His special and covenanted mercies. Into the open heart of humanity, through the open door of personal faith, His life has ever come, according to His own will and covenanted promise, and in coming has made those

who received His Spirit partakers of His divine nature.

The Church may some day break away from the narrow confines of its logical and delimited catholicity, and become sufficiently inclusive to embrace all those who are embraced in the Body of Christ through the baptism of incorporation into His life, and who, through His spirit, reveal His living and abiding presence.

CHAPTER IX

THE INTENTION AND EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH

WHILE, with a zeal that has not always been attended with reverence and humility, but which has often been attended by arrogance and the self-sufficiency of a vast ignorance, the Church has often in its past history applied false logic to forge binding fetters and restraints upon the liberties of the souls of men, she has all too frequently failed to observe the very fundamental principles of logic itself.

While the logical process may, and frequently does, lead to false conclusions by reason of the finite and incomplete, and therefore inadequate conceptions of God, and of spiritual truth,

which are stated in the premises, yet, the great fundamental principles of logic are essentially true, and when violated in the thought-processes of men, the expression of truth becomes of necessity inadequate and incomplete. The claims made of catholicity are frequently seen to have been vitiated and overthrown by reason of the fact that, even while endeavouring to establish certain contentions, by what seemed to be a sure logical process, the fundamental principles and abiding maxims of logic were overlooked; which has resulted in the fact that the logical conclusions reached stand contradicted, in the claim they make, by the logical principles and fundamental maxims of truth which have been violated or unobserved during the reasoning and constructive process. Thus the constructive process proves destructive to the very catholic claims which they sought to establish.

The law of thought that "the minimum of *intension* is the maximum of *extension,* while on the other hand, the minimum of *extension*

is the maximum of *intension,*"* furnishes an example and illustration of what happens when the logical process is used to prove the fact that a certain superadded ecclesiastical dogma, or theory, is of divine authority, or of ancient and universal sanction, and must, therefore, be received as an essential note of the Catholic Church, or be accepted as a necessary article of the Catholic faith, or be assented to as a condition precedent to loyal membership in the Catholic Church.

These superimposed dogmas, ceremonies and decrees add to the *intensive* notes of the Church; they, however, limit the *extensive* hold of the Church upon the thought and faith of men. It was just this that the Christ charged the Jews with having done. "Ye have made the Commandments of God of none effect by your traditions, teaching as the doctrines of God the commandments of men." (St. Mat. xv, 6, 9.) Having identified these intensive notes, which had been added and made binding by tradition,

* "Theory of Thought," Noah K. Davis, p. 36.

with the law and revelation of God, their church became so delimited in their own conception of it that it was not extensive enough to embrace Christ and His apostles, or to comprehend, or include, their teaching, and they accused Him of being a heretic and crucified Him, and persecuted and killed, as they could, His followers.

This was the charge made by the continental and English reformers against the Church of Rome. It was pointed out that, by her decrees and superadded doctrines and ceremonies, Rome had made the Church more and more intensive; that is, its notes, and distinctive attributes had been increased. It was doubtless reasoned that these notes would enrich the life of the Church and increase its power. It was doubtless reasoned, also, that each new doctrine added could either be proven from the teaching of the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers, or else it was logically reasoned that their authority, as universally binding, rested upon the logically proven right of infallible popes and infallible councils to decree dogmas to be held

essential, which to deny would be heresy, and which to repudiate would be schism.

The Church failed to foresee that the thought of subsequent generations might not be of a nature to be included within the reach of the Church whose extensive catholicity was gradually being delimited by each superadded dogma, established as true, or judged expedient, by the logical working of the ecclesiastic mind. It failed to perceive that the liberated mind would be more *extensive* than the Church, which they were making by each dogma more *intensive,* and thus less and less extensive in its scope and inclusive capacity. The time, however, came when others saw it.

CHAPTER X

THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE SYLLOGISM

THE syllogism, as it represents the reasoning process, and when it is used for the purpose of formulating and expressing divine truth, should be conceived in reverence and born in humility; for, as Samual Coleridge says: "there is small chance of truth at the goal where there is not childlike humility at the starting post."* About the syllogism there should ever be the consciousness of the finiteness of human thought. It should breathe the atmosphere of God's transcendent life when stating the fact of His immanence. It should beware of conclusions which set limitations upon God, and should ever doubt both the

* "Aids to Reflection," p. 182.

wisdom and truth of a reasoning process which ends with binding Christ and the Eternal Spirit to conform to, and be restrained by, the conclusions at which human reason arrives. Before the conclusion is sent on its journey to meet the problems of life and to help guide the pilgrim-seeker after truth; before it is sanctioned by authority, and incorporated into the system of vital truth, it should look with far-reaching vision down the long vistas of time. It should ask the far future very earnest questions. It should ask:— Will I be needed then? Will I, who seem to state the truth to-day, fetter the truth seeker of to-morrow? Am I too exclusive? In the fresh exultation of youth, am I too arrogant of what was reverenced as the venerated faith of the years long gone, the truth which carried many burdens, and which, though now worn with age, was the guide and help of saints departed? These questions the truth seeker, the truth formulator, should ask himself. With this atmosphere of reverence, humility, forbearance, and wide horizon, the syllogism would

more largely aid the pilgrims of the night, and do better service to the Church of Christ.

One wonders, one cannot be very sure, if much that has been done and said with the claim of infallible authority would be done and said to-day if it was not for the sanctions and contentions of the past. One wonders if the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or of Consubstantiation, or any doctrine which vainly undertook to tell in human words just how the Eternal Christ is present in the Eucharist, and just how He worked His will, and communicated His presence, would be formulated and sanctioned to-day by a general council of the Church, if there were no previous pronouncement on the subject save the simple words of the Master Himself. Because, after all, men cannot know. They feel and know His presence in sacraments, and in the written and spoken words of truth, and in the lives of those in whom His Spirit is incarnate, but the past has taught us that the mystery of God in His relation to the soul is too

great to be adequately, and, therefore, ultimately expressed in human definitions and dogmas.

CHAPTER XI

THE REFORMATION A DISTINCTLY CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

THE term *"the Catholic Church,"* as it occurs in this discussion, is used in the comprehensive sense which makes it co-extensive with the whole number of those baptised into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and who hold the faith, revealed in the great Gospel of Redemption, as epitomised in the Apostles' Creed, as essential to salvation. It was for this comprehensive interpretation that the English reformers contended. They sought to abolish the superimposed intensive notes and attributes, namely, the superadded doctrines and practices which had so delimited the extension of the Church that it could no longer

hold within itself the enlightened mind, and spiritual faith, and liberated thought of many thousands. To the ages past, the English Fathers said:— Ye have made the catholic claim and the catholic inclusiveness of the Church of Christ void by your traditions and dogmas. In seeking through the process of intension, and with logical justification of reasoning, to enrich and empower the organisation, you have so delimited its catholicity that we find ourselves bound to protest against the acts of man that have proven contrary to the spiritual comprehensiveness of His Body, the Church. The reformers, in so far as they were protesting against the errors, or the ill-advised work of man, were asserting and defending the catholic conception of the Church of Christ. If, therefore, to-day any component part of the Church has the historic and logical claim to any right to use, as descriptive of its position, the term "catholic," it is surely those who, in sympathy with the reformers, are still protestant against the erroneous practices, dogmas and traditions

of the Church of Rome. If these erroneous positions were still made binding in this Church, as they are in the Church of Rome, it would invalidate her catholic claim by making this Church so largely intensive and so narrowly extensive that many who profess and call themselves Christians, and who give the witness of the indwelling presence of the Spirit, would be excluded from the pale of her inclusiveness, and be left with the assurance and witness of a vital faith and a spiritual incorporation with Christ, outside the comprehensiveness of what would then be a misnamed "Holy Catholic Church."

CHAPTER XII

CAN THE CHURCH BE DEFINED?

THE purpose of this book is to state certain principles; to challenge serious thought, and to ask certain practical and pertinent questions which need to be squarely and fearlessly faced. It is not our purpose to try to answer all the questions raised. The answers to many of them may yet be far removed. It is at least worth something to see that the answers now given and commonly current are either wholly or partly wrong, and, therefore, unsatisfactory and untenable.

A definition of the Church that is adequate and satisfactory and generally approved has never been formulated. The truth of this assertion is self-evident. A definition is given

in the 19th Article of Religion. It is the only one in the Book of Common Prayer, and there is none in the Constitution of the Church, nor is there one in the Gospel of Christ, or in the literature of the New Testament. The Church is in many places described. It is spoken of as "the Body of Christ," as being "one, catholic and apostolic." It is called in the shorter creed, "the holy Catholic Church." It is spoken of in the New Testament under a variety of descriptive terms such as "the household of God," an army, a body, etc.

None of these descriptions and designations constitutes in any sense a definition. Indeed, each term in the description and designation has been subject to varied definitions. Into these definitions are invariably inserted the theories of the definers, and as long as theories differ and are insisted upon, the possibility of an adequate and satisfactory definition of the Church seems far removed, if not quite impossible. Take, for instance, the definition in the 19th Article of Religion. "The visible Church

of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

Left to each man's private interpretation, this definition would doubtless be generally accepted as sufficiently adequate and comprehensive. Under these conditions, if they could ever obtain, Romanist and Protestant could both accept it, as could the catholic churchman, be he Roman or Protestant catholic in his teachings and convictions.

But once begin to define the terms in this or any other definition of the Church, and insist upon the acceptance of the term definition, and the whole ecclesiastical controversy of the ages is opened again. How many sacraments must be duly ministered? When and by whom are they duly ministered? Did Christ's ordinance confine their administration to the ministry of the apostolic succession, as the expression is generally defined by many in this Church? How

can this be proven without question of doubt? Does the restriction, if allowed, apply to both sacraments alike? If not, why not? If so, then why did the General Convention declare that all who were baptised into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were thereby incorporated into the Holy Catholic Church? What then are all those things "that of necessity are requisite"? Some will answer: "A ministry in the line of the apostolic succession." Others will ask: "Why then did not the definition say so?"

To define the Church is evidently impossible. Yet current, as well as historic ecclesiastical controversies, practically all spring from a failure to agree upon a definition, or from the insistence that a party definition shall be accepted by everybody, which, of course, is quite impossible.

The perfect senselessness of raising and continuing contentions which are based upon what should be by this time recognised as the absolute impossibility of a common definition, should be apparent to all men who think.

As a matter of fact, the Church visible today is in reality neither one, catholic, nor apostolic. Its oneness has been broken by schism. Its catholicity has been delimited by exclusive claims, and its apostolic nature has been vitiated in large measure by the spirit of each age through which its course has run, and by the age in which it now exists. Were the Church not of divine origin, and did it not live by a divine life present within, it would long since have perished from the face of the earth; for it has ever been treated much as men treated the despised, rejected, crucified, and yet ever-living Lord.

If we cannot agree even among ourselves upon any adequate definition of the Church actual and visible, then why should we continue to speak and act as though a definition either sufficiently inclusive or sufficiently exclusive had been determined upon?

Would it not, in the plain light of facts and conditions as they exist, be far better if we agreed not to attempt to define the Church un-

til it had become in reality what it was planned and intended to be by the Christ Himself? Is it not just because the Church actual is not the Church ideal that we cannot define it? To define it as it is, would be to deny it as He purposed it to become.

It is very difficult, if not quite impossible, accurately and adequately to define a vital organism in the process of becoming that which it is destined to be. That the Church is destined to be *one, holy, catholic and apostolic* is a proposition concerning which we are all in thorough agreement. That it is any of these now, he invites denial who ventures to assert.

Therefore, to delimit the Church, in its inclusiveness, and exclude from its nurture and admonition those who do not conform to a standard which does not exist would seem to be as unwise and untenable a procedure as it would be to say that we cannot now be found in Christ because we are not yet found to be perfect even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHURCH UNDER A DESCRIPTIVE TITLE

WHILE the Church cannot be adequately defined, it can be described in terms sufficiently definite, and adequately comprehensive to furnish the mind with a concept and ideal inclusive of the faith and spiritual experience of man in his relation to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

The descriptive statement suggested by Christ when, breaking the bread, He gave it to His disciples saying, "This is my Body," and that used by St. Paul, who frequently describes the Church as "the Body of Christ," present the Church as a living organism. This concept is practical, definite, vital, inclusive, progres-

sive, and deeply spiritual. It is individual and corporate; concrete, and yet mystical in its conclusiveness. It offers what would seem to be the promise of a definition of the Church Catholic that would be adequate, inclusive and scriptural. This we will not, however, attempt to formulate.

CHRIST THE HEAD

This concept of the Church definitely recognises Christ as the Head of the Body. His mind, His heart, His will, through His indwelling and over-ruling Spirit, vitalise, direct, and empower the living organism.

The Body, the Church, is built up primarily from within. What Sir Oliver Lodge calls the divine background of phenomena, what the Bible calls the creative will of God, what the Prayer Book calls the prevenient and co-operative power of the Eternal Spirit, builds the Body of Christ, His Church. It is the outward and visible result of God working in us, both to

will and to do His good pleasure. It is the self-revelation, the self-expression of the ever-outflowing and incoming life of God, the Self-incarnation of the divine Spirit in humanity, which builds up what St. Paul calls the Body of Christ.

THE IMMEDIATE APPROACH

The Christ, through His Spirit, speaks directly to the souls of men. Prior to the existence of any ministerial order, or written revelation, or sacramental institution, the voice of God spoke to the souls of men; "Be still and know that I am God." The silence has ever been a vital medium through which the Divine has entered into the inner shrine of human life. There the soul has ever heard the whispering voice of the nearby God. There at the unseen altar, human sacrifice of the costliest kind has ever been offered, as man has made response to the inner voice which said; "My son, give me thine heart." There has been no record in-

scribed to tell of the deep devotion and reverent offering of humanity in silent consecration before these unseen altars of the soul. Like Nicodemus, thousands come to Him by night. We cannot count them yet. We cannot discount them. We may hope and believe that in the shadowless land of closer communion and deeper understanding, they will be made manifest in Him who has manifested Himself to them.

The Christ needs their outward confession of faith, and it would seem that He had these mystical souls in mind when He constituted His Church. The sacraments of incorporation and of sustenance and unity, ordained by Him, were very elemental, very simple, and very mystical. In her after growth the visible Church may not have been as mindful as she might of the sensitive, delicate outreaching of these souls of the inner shrine. She may have unwittingly scared them back into their secret reserve as they looked out and listened for a way to build themselves into His visible Body.

Her array of confessions, ringing with the clash of minds; her ordinances made coldly formal, or too glowingly and fervently ritualistic; her channels of grace, which are His Channels of grace, proclaimed with a logical claim of exclusiveness which seemed to contradict their own souls' experience of an immediate relationship with God, have tended to make them doubtful and timorous, and so they have continued to worship at the inner shrine. Yet, every shrine where God meets and illumines a soul of man sends forth some light which, gleaming through the windows of human character, reveals the presence of Him who lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

THE MEDIATE APPROACH

Christ the Head of the Church ordained certain means through which the life which was in Him might be infused into His Body, the Church; and by which the Body might be built up into unity with Him and within itself, and

be enabled thus to reveal and express the fulness of the divine life.

THE MINISTRY AND THE SACRAMENTS

One of the mediate means of the divine communication is the ministry of the Church. "The Christ," writes St. Paul (Ephesians iv), "hath given some, apostles; some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; unto the perfecting of the saints for the doing of service, for the building up of the body of Christ; till we all come unto the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a complete man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

The unity of which the apostle here speaks is primarily and distinctly spiritual. He, however, foresees that this unity may be destroyed by the independent working of the natural mind, and, therefore, urges the close union of the Body with Christ, its living and governing Head, through faith and spiritual knowledge

"that we be not tossed like a wave, and carried about by every wind of teaching by the artifice of men in cunning craftiness, according to wily error." (Marginal reading, "Methodical Fraud.")

The chief function of the ministry is the building up of the Body in love. The unity of the Church is a result to be obtained through the inner working of the spirit of Christ in and through His Body. Prior to all thought of unity of form, St. Paul urges the necessity for "endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" by living in obedience to the calling of Christ Jesus "with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, bearing with one another in love."

There is ample evidence open to the student of Church history to show that before the Church had gone many centuries on its pilgrimage, it came under the influence of forces which had their rise not in the mind of Christ, the Head of the Body, but in the mind which had been impressed by the force of external author-

ity, and dominated by the conception of the strength and grandeur of formal unity, resting upon the authority of external decrees, and made binding by the power of inflicting penalties for the suppression of the spirit of schism. The unity of the Roman empire moulded the conception of the unity of the Church. The Church and the state together came to see the mutual advantages which would follow from a material and spiritual alliance. We find emperors calling general councils at a time when this one voice reached further than could the voice of any one bishop in its power to command. Later we find that the balance of power has shifted, and the highly organised Church calls emperors and bids them lay their crowns at the feet of him who has grown, by assent, to be chief bishop, to receive their crowns again at his hand, to be worn during the pope's good pleasure.

Thus there grew in the Church a monarchical, an autocratic conception of orders and of Church government. The bishop became a prel-

ate; the pope, the lord of lords and king of kings.

The historic succession of orders, essential under any system to maintain the continuity of the outward and visible Church, and to preserve its outward unity, and to give integrity and force to its witness to the truth, became, under this monarchical system, autocratic and unrelenting in its claims and in its imperious demands. The idea of the apostolic succession was insisted upon as constituting the divine right of bishops to rule, not only over the people, but over kings and emperors also. It was the chief defence of the doctrine of the two swords. It brooked no opposition. A further study of Church history gives evidence that those who most vigorously asserted this claim to the exclusive succession were more mindful of preserving and establishing the claim to authority than of perpetuating the succession of apostolic graces and virtues, and the continued flow of spiritual life and power through the unbroken channel. Indeed, instances are in

evidence, all down the course of Church history, where the appearance of grace and virtue and spiritual liberty in those who ventured to question the decrees and interpretations of those who ruled with the claim of a divinely given right, through the unbroken succession, were pronounced heretic, and cut off from union with the Church, whose formal unity they threatened to disrupt by the assertion of any spiritual truth which was contrary to the autocratic decree sanctioned by the claim of the unbroken right, through succession, to exclusive authority. The power to enforce the claim lay not in the power to prove that truth, as well as the right to proclaim truth, had been divinely guaranteed through the succession, but in the power of the Inquisition, in the force of the sword, in the power of keys with which heaven and hell could be unlocked, and open the way to the eternal enforcement of the results of obedience to the authority perpetuated through the succession.

Since the Inquisition has vanished, and the

power of the sword has been removed, since the fires of persecution have been quenched, and the power of the pope over purgatory has lost its terror, it has been found that the claim to the right of an exclusive authority to bind men to Christ, or to the devil, by reason of the right of succession, is no longer held by all men, at all times and everywhere. Indeed, it is very questionable if it ever was held to this extent.

It would be well for those branches of the Church Catholic who still maintain, not alone the fact of the historic succession, but also, the exclusive claims of the apostolic succession, as it relates to authority, to pause and ask just how much of this claim rests upon scriptural and spiritual grounds, and how much is an historic survival of claims made and maintained in the struggle of the Church to secure material power and temporal sway over every other form of authority whatsoever.

It were well to do this for more reasons than one. The divine right to exclusiveness of power

and authority is being seriously questioned all over the world at the present time. Men are asking that those who make the claim show their credentials. A tree, they say, is known by its fruits. What are the fruits of this system? The autocratic, the aristocratic system is being challenged as never before. Democracy is asking autocracy to give proof of its exclusive right to make absolute decrees which restrain the liberties of the people. The question as it affects the future of empires is closely akin to the question as it affects the Church. It is authority versus liberty. The ancient system, bulwarked by ancient claims, and supported by ancient theories and interpretations, such as hereditary descent, and the divine right, is to-day face to face with a new theory of government, a new interpretation, and a somewhat more comprehensive idea of divine rights. Among them is the right which men are asserting to be free. The power of the monarch, of the autocracy, is the force which it commands. The people pay the bills and canvass the results. They may admit the divine

right as long as it does not lay upon them burdens too grievous to be borne. They pay the bills as long as they do not feel the weight of oppression. They remain subservient as long as they feel that their liberties are not threatened. When, however, the system grows too iron clad, and rights become exclusive, and the guns which the system commands with supreme authority are in danger of being used to make the people more subservient, then new conceptions of the divine rights spring into being. The man and the gun come into conflict. In the state it is called revolution. In the Church it is called reformation or reconstruction. The question as to which will triumph in the end is not hard to answer. The only question that is hard to answer is, when will the end come? The gun is dead. The man lives. The man may live to make other guns, but if used against the divine rights of the people, they, too, will be overthrown in due time.

And yet, it is evident that the two concepts are not necessarily contradictory. Authority

and liberty are not only not exclusive and antagonistic terms—they are mutually dependent the one upon the other. Like the conservative and radical elements in government, and in society, they are both essential to the security of the state, and of the Church. Authority which overrides personal liberty results in despotism. Liberty, undirected and unrestrained by authority, results in license and lawlessness. The individual and the state, the churchman and the Church, owe mutual obligations the one to the other. Their interests are ultimately identical. The problem in state and Church is to find and establish the right balance of power, namely, to secure authority without arrogance, and liberty without license. The objection against autocratic prelacy cannot be rightly charged against a system of Church government by bishops; nor are the objections against individualism a valid argument for an autocratic episcopate. The exclusive claims of the priesthood, entrenched behind the logical and ecclesiastical claims of an apostolic succession of authority,

are not the only alternative to lawlessness and absolute individualism in the Church. There is the central ground position which will be stated and considered later on.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MESSAGE OF THE TRANSITION

THE past and the future are both calling to the present. The call comes as a challenge. Old things are passing away. But they are passing before the present. And as they pass they are asking:— Am I worth while? It is a motley throng which we are called to review. The ancient priest approaches, vested with the insignia of authority. He holds the jewelled chalice in one hand and the scroll bearing the record of his unbroken priestly ancestry in the other. He pauses to tell us of time-worn cathedrals where he has served, of ancient chants gloriously sung, of processions gorgeously robed passing with solemn tread through long-drawn aisles, and pausing before

the altar high and lifted up, crowned with the cross, and aglow with candles. Do we need him? Shall we strip him of his jewelled stole and sacerdotal garb? Shall we take from him his golden chalice, and the roll of his priestly descent? Shall we hush the ancient music which echoes in his soul? Shall we turn the procession, in which he is wont to walk, and make it stop at the pulpit, or at least at the lectern, but forbid it passing in ritualistic reverence to the altar? Shall we hurt him by cribbing his cross, or leave him there in the darkness without any candles?

The prophet passes! His garb is simple. He walks as one conscious of mission. He holds in his hand the Book which the priest had in his pocket. He has a far wistful look in his piercing eyes. He stops to tell us of his task, of his heart's desire, and of his hope. He is a man of visions unfulfilled. He speaks as one filled with a spirit of a noble discontent. He is impatient of restraint. He tells of temples closed to him, and of limitations imposed upon

the message of righteousness which burns within his soul by reason of the decrees set up to defend the imperilled truth of centuries long gone. He is a man of prayer. He bears in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus. Do we need him? Shall we set him free?

Next comes the monk. He is garbed in black and girded about the waist. A gleaming cross is pendant on his breast. In his hand is his ancient book of devotion. He pauses to tell us of the vision seen in his cell. It came to him while he knelt in prayer after having fasted long. The glow of the vision is upon his face, made thin by long abstinence. He has come forth because he has heard the cry of the world's great need, and he has come to serve. Do we need him? Shall we demand that he divest himself of that with which his order has vested him? Shall we forbid him the solitude of his cell? Shall we obliterate his personality, and send him forth to try to minister as some one other than the man he is?

Then there passes the non-conformist minis-

ter. He is an aged man. He reminds us of the parson of Goldsmith's "Deserted Village." We ask his name. We turn to our Church Year Book, but it is not there. His credentials bear no mitred symbol of authority. We look at him askance, for, as the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans, we may confer by the wayside upon terms of courtesy with him, but dare we co-operate? Is he of the Church? Some one whispers: "No, his orders are not valid." Another cries out: "He is a sectarian!" The pilgrim wonders why he is the cause of all this tumult and contention. He has not asked to be admitted into the Church any further than he considers himself admitted already. Seeing that he is about to be unchurched, he bows and passes on.

He is followed by several men in the garb of rustics. They are kind and simple folk who have come, following the parson on his pilgrimage. As they speak of him, there is a ring of conviction in their voices, and a tone of deep sincerity, and of honest pride. "What," they

ask, "is this we heard as we stood near, of our pastor not having the apostolic succession, and not being able to administer to us the Supper of the Lord? He is the apostle of the Lord through all the mountains and valleys where we live, and is loved by all for his exceeding goodness. He knows the Scriptures, and from them preaches Christ, and many has he led to receive Him as their Saviour. He has baptised well-nigh all the folk in the mountains. Through all kinds of weather, he goes about visiting the poor, and pointing the way to brighter worlds to those who are sick unto death. And, stranger, when the old man kneels down in homes where sorrow has come, and prays, you feel the very presence of God, and heaven comes down, and we seem to see the open door through which our loved ones have passed on into the light. Many a boy in the mountains, that was bringing naught but sorrow home, has he gone after and brought to Christ. Men who once spent their time fighting and drinking moonshine, and turning their homes into hell, have been

converted under his preaching, and changed their ways, so that now you would hardly know the country if you had known it as it was before he came. To see these men kneeling on Sunday taking the sacred sacrament would set your heart aglow with gladness, and many a woman turns away from the table of the Lord, and walks down the aisle with her man by her side, with tears of joy streaming down her face. Stranger, it is like the parable of the prodigal son just being acted out up there in the mountains with our pastor going out all the time bringing the wanderers home. You say your church does not call him a minister in good and regular standing? Where lies the fault with him? He serves the Master as His minister, and is honoured by Him. He has the tokens of his Master's acceptance of his work. He has received the Spirit, and speaks and lives with His power. Why do you call him your opponent, a heretic and schismatic? It didn't seem to matter much with him, but it hurts us, because all these years he has been our friend, our guide

and comforter, and the only minister in the mountains."

The time and the audience seem not propitious for a defence of the historic grounds upon which rest the exclusive claims of the Church. The men follow their pastor, and will probably continue to follow him through the gates of Paradise.

They leave us thinking, and again we ask:— "Do we need him? Who are we, anyway?" "Guardians," it is said, "and custodians of a sacred trust." And what is this trust? "The Church," we reply. "Whose Church?" it is asked, and we answer, "The Church of Christ, the divinely constituted repository of sacred orders and of sacred sacraments and of the Holy Bible and the ancient creeds." Well, whose fault is it then that the man dismissed with courteous firmness, or with the brand of schismatic and heretic, is on the outside, and not of "the Church"? Is it the result of an inadequate definition? Are we sure that we have defined "the Church" in terms sufficiently com-

prehensive when we have, by our definition, excluded him? Are we sure that the definition which excludes us from co-operation with the minister of irregular orders is of divine sanction? Or is it upon historic grounds that we leave him without the pale of the strictly bounded One, Catholic and Apostolic Church? We should be very sure. The procession is fast passing on. We must choose those who may be counted worthy to be numbered with us in what we call "the Catholic Church." Later we will return to the priest, the prophet, the monk and the minister.

CHAPTER XV

THE TERMS "CATHOLIC" AND "CATHOLIC SANCTION"

MUCH confusion of thought results from the use of the term "catholic" in didactic discourses and controversial writings, by reason of the fact that the term is not defined by those who use it. This results in misunderstanding, and in confusion of thought. There seems to be no generally accepted standard as to what constitutes the authority by which catholic sanction may be said to exist for teachings and practices which are current among us, and which are defended by their adherents on the ground that they are teachings and practices of unquestioned catholic sanction and authority.

We are mindful of the answer made by a teacher to a dull scholar that he could give to the scholar a reason for a thing, but that he could not give him an understanding. We are also mindful that it was for an understanding heart and mind that Solomon prayed.

It would be for the good of the Church if some understanding could be reached as to the meaning and significance of the terms used among us. It would minister to clearness of thought, and would tend to remove a good deal of mutual misunderstanding which now results from the use of undefined terms.

The laymen of the Church must, at times, be very much confused, and find it very hard to know just what to think and just what to believe. It is not to be wondered at when the priests of the Church use language which fails entirely to convey to one clergyman of the Church the concept that is in the mind of another. It is surely a waste of time and energy and thought to engage in endless controversies, and then come to find that we were talk-

ing about entirely different things, or about two separate and distinct aspects of the same thing. Perhaps there is no word current among us which gives rise to more misunderstanding and confusion of thought than this word "Catholic."

Certain practices and teachings are set forth and defended by individuals and parties in the Church as being of catholic sanction. When asked by what sanction they have been made catholic, answers become confused, or many become confused to whom the answers are given. We are told that they are sanctioned by the Catholic Councils, but there is no one to tell us with final authority which are "the Catholic Councils." The Orthodox Eastern Church, the Roman Church, and the Anglican Communion are not in agreement upon this point. We look among the decrees of the Councils, extending from 325 to the seventh council held in 787, and fail to find the catholic sanction claimed for certain theories, interpretations and practices. Then we are told the name of the council giving

sanction to the doctrine or teaching, and find it was a national or provincial council, or else the authority of one of the several Roman Catholic Councils, which claim to be general. It naturally becomes somewhat hard to determine what kinds of councils were capable of giving catholic sanction to doctrines and practices.

Or, if perchance we are cited to the ancient Fathers and turn to them, we either find the point in question not mentioned among them, or else find conflicting testimonies. And when asked which are the catholic fathers, there seems to be, at times, a disposition to answer that the catholic fathers are the fathers who held the truth which we hold.

When the National Councils of the English Church met in order that the English Church Fathers might express their desire to make the Church more truly catholic as they interpreted catholicity, by repudiating the superadded notes, dogmas and teachings which they held to have been imposed upon the Church without catholic sanction, according to the old rule of

what constituted catholic sanction, they cast aside and repudiated many of these superadded intensive notes so as to make the Church more truly extensive, and thus, in their judgment, more truly catholic.

Against these superadded practices and teachings, the English Church protested on the ground that they had, without sufficient authority, been fostered upon the faith once delivered to the saints. "The Church," they said, "as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation."

Many teachings and practices current among us would seem not to have what the national Church Councils of England regarded as catholic sanction, and they lack the consent and authorisation of the National Branch of the Church in America where they are introduced and advocated.

It is not questioned at this point as to whether or not these things, claimed to be of catholic au-

thority, are edifying to the Church. The teachings and practices in question may be defensible on this ground, and on this ground they might be defended by those who so believe. It might, perhaps, be shown that they minister to reverence, and that they enhance the spirit of devotion, and that they should, therefore, receive the sanction of the National Council of this Church in America. This would be a perfectly justifiable method of procedure, and if it was not insisted that these doctrines and practices should be made binding upon the faith and practice of the whole Church, the advocates seeking permission to hold and follow them might win many adherents. But, when a vague claim is made that they are of catholic authority, and of unquestionable catholic sanction, and when it is advocated with the expressed or implied insinuation or implication that those who do not believe and conform to them are untrue to the catholic heritage of the Church, then, those against whom such aspersions are made surely have the right to ask that the terms

"catholic," and "catholic sanction," and "catholic authority," be more clearly and adequately defined.

The student of psychology can quite well understand, and fully appreciate, how and why many of these teachings and ceremonial rites should commend themselves to certain types of mind, and find a devotional response in certain types of human nature. From this point of view, it can be quite well understood why the advocates of these views and practices should firmly believe that they are advocating what they believe to be principles which are catholic in their nature and intent. This, however, is another question from the claim of a catholic sanction by any expressed catholic authority.

In view, therefore, of the confusion resulting from the constant use of undefined terminology, would it not be conducive to clearness of thought and to a better understanding, if those who used the terms "catholic," "catholic sanction," "catholic authority," and "Catholic Church" took the pains, and did others the

service, to define the terms in order that language might be the means of communicating intelligible ideas and definite concepts, and not produce confusion of thought, out of which constantly arise endless and useless controversies?

To illustrate the point in question as to the accepted meaning of the term "the Catholic Church," it would be well to define and explain just what is meant.

Is the term used to describe the Body of Christ, inclusive of all those who have been baptised into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? There are those who thus use the word to describe the organisation as to its membership.

As to the Faith: It may, however, be said that this membership must of necessity accept Holy Writ as being the inspired revelation of the word of God, as a prerequisite to the right of membership. This contention would be admitted without controversy.

It may be further said that this membership

must also accept the faith expressed in the Apostles' Creed. As this faith is summed up in the baptismal service, and in the catechism of this Church, it is accepted now by practically the whole membership of those who profess and call themselves Christians.

The Sacraments: It may be further insisted that this membership must of necessity be constituted through incorporation in the Body of Christ through baptism. This is universally accepted by all who are of the Christian Church.

Beyond this point, what shall be said and held, and what is held by those who use the term? The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is surely a catholic institution. It is almost universally held among Christians. By some its validity is made to depend absolutely upon the regularity of the ministry celebrating in the service. Vast numbers in the Holy Catholic Church have this sacrament from the hands of such a ministry. These, upon any theory, are considered within the membership of the Body described as "Holy Catholic." But what of

others? They consider that they hold and receive this sacrament. There are those who hold that their irregular ministry invalidates this claim. Is it held by those who use the term "The Catholic Church," in an exclusive sense, that those who have been incorporated into its membership, by Holy Baptism, are excluded from its membership, that is, are made schismatic from the Body of Christ, by reason of this irregularity? Or, upon this theory, are they still of the membership of the Catholic Church, but irregular in practice and in conformity?

Is the threefold ministry, unbroken in continuity, essential to the existence of the Holy Catholic Church? Or, is the threefold ministry as an historic inheritance of the Catholic Church, essential, as Hooker claims, to its "well being," but not, of necessity, essential to the extension of its membership, nor of necessity, therefore, essential to the existence in the Holy Catholic Church, of communions composed of a part of the catholic membership, holding

imperfectly and incompletely the catholic heritage?

If this be true, would it not be better to distinguish between the terms "the Catholic Church," and "the Catholic heritage?"

It is evident that we are dealing here with just the same kinds of distinctions and of qualifying and descriptive terms as are of necessity used in defining and describing the nature and place of the sons of God in His Kingdom. There are those who are His children by nature, others by adoption, and those who are still His sons though they have wandered into far countries. It is exceedingly hard to define a vital and eternal relationship, and harder still to make our human terminology adequately descriptive, and sufficiently definite and inclusive, of an institution which is the living Body of the Living Christ.

Then, too, it would be well to make it very clear as to what is meant by the term "catholic sanction," and the term "catholic practice," if the terms are to be used freely among us.

Are the terms so used intended to be descriptive of intensive notes of the catholic heritage, or the notes which test and delimit the catholic extension of the Church? Are they terms of enrichment, or qualities essential to the existence of what is called the "catholic Church"?

This is just the question that arose between St. Paul, St. Peter and the other apostles relative to the Christian Church in apostolic times. It was asked that it be determined what practices and customs and observances should be held as essential. Observances had been insisted upon by some which St. Paul held would delimit the comprehensiveness of the Church, if made a test of loyalty, or essential to membership in the catholic Church. The question was taken before an apostolic council, and the decree given was that "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." (Acts xv, Gal. ii.)

It would seem reasonable to hope and to ask that the term "catholic," as descriptive of,

and as limiting the comprehensiveness of, the Church should be used, with the spirit of apostolic sanction, in this wide and comprehensive sense. It would also seem that it would conduce to a larger readiness to accept the term if it could be used in defence of the claim to observe the "necessary things." If these necessary things are held to be the things declared essential to salvation in the Gospel of redemption, then the term becomes sufficiently inclusive to conform to the sense in which it is doubtless used in the creeds of the Church.

Beyond this, the terms "catholic sanction," "catholic practice," etc., might well be confined to descriptions, definitions, interpretations, and practices pertaining to the ancient heritage of the Church Catholic. In any event, the sense and scope of the terms, when used, should be, for the sake of clearness, explained and defined.

When the term "catholic sanction," or "catholic authority," is used, it would minister to a better understanding if what constituted the sanction or authority were definitely stated. Is

the sanction or authority claimed that of an Œcumenical Council or papal decree? Or does it mean the sanction of the undivided Roman and Eastern Church. Or, does it mean the sanction of some council, or the general practice of the Western Church, under Roman domination, prior to the Reformation? Or, again, is it meant that the teaching or practice is inherently catholic in its nature, and so fully in harmony with the teaching of Scripture, and the revealed will of Christ, that it deserves to be received and held as an integral and indispensable part of the catholic faith and practice? Oh, is it meant that the doctrine and practice was sanctioned by authority, or by use in the Roman Catholic Church prior to the English Reformation, and continued to be held and taught by many individuals in the English Church subsequent to the Reformation, but which, since the Reformation, has had the ecclesiastical authority and sanction of the Roman Church alone, or perhaps of the Greek and Old Catholic Church also? Then, too, it

would be interesting and helpful to know whether the term "catholic sanction" applies to theories of interpretation as well as to the facts of the faith and the historic continuity of certain rites and practices in the Church.

If it be said that it would be difficult to clearly define in just what sense the terms are, in each instance, used, it may be said, also, that it is still more difficult to understand just what the claim for the authority and sanction is worth unless we are told very definitely just what the person making the claim has in mind as the basis on which it is founded.

When it happens that, as a result of holding claims of "catholic authority," and "catholic sanction," the rights and liberties of others in the Church are delimited; and when it is sought, as a result of these exclusive views, to restrain others in this Church from acting within the bounds of what they feel is the liberty of their inheritance as sons of God, and as loyal members of this Church, then the reason becomes still more cogent and imperative for insist-

ing that the claims of catholic authority and sanction be more clearly stated and defined.

If the right and duty of the Church in this hour of supreme crisis to hold conference with Protestant Communions and to co-operate with them is denied upon the basis of interpretations of the ordinal, and theories of the succession, claimed to be of catholic authority, it is but fair to ask the source of this authority, and proof for the idea, which seems to be assumed, that this claim has ever been officially admitted by either the independent Anglican Church, or by this Church in America.

If, when opportunities for conference and co-operative relationship with our Protestant friends (or opponents, as they are sometimes called by the exclusive school), present themselves, this Church by legislative decree refuses to permit those who favour such action to engage in it with her official sanction, then this Church will indirectly, through her legislative action, give sanction to these theories and

claims as being binding upon the whole Episcopal Church.

We have arrived at the point where this vital and far-reaching question has been forced to the issue. The issue is forced by those who assert that their theories and interpretations are of catholic authority, and who deny the right of the Board of Missions and of the Church to participate in conferences and co-operative endeavours with communions whose orders are not of the apostolic succession. It is a question which arises out of the world crisis which we face, and out of the world challenge to a materially bound and ecclesiastically dominated and divided Christianity.

Those in the Church who are not disposed to question the catholic claim to exclusive interpretation so long as it is confined to the purpose of satisfying those who make it as to the nature and kind of their own priesthood, and their own position of exclusiveness; do claim that they are not unreasonable in asking that the terms which restrict the liberty of others be

clearly defined. Nor are they unreasonable nor contentious in insisting that the ground and authority for interpretations and opinions claimed as of catholic sanction be definitely stated, before the whole Church, through legislative enactment, or pronouncement, is asked to give sanction to these exclusive claims by denying those who hold a different view the liberty to express their convictions in conference and co-operative relationship.

By such restrictions, the General Convention would give practical sanction to views and contentions, to theories and opinions, which, when they have been considered on their merits, have never received the official sanction of either the Anglican or the American Church. This is not the way to change Church polity.

That the English Church Fathers conferred and co-operated with ministers not of her order, is a fact written clearly in the pages of history, and that among the first bishops consecrated in this Church in America, there were those who did so, is likewise known to all who

know the early history of this branch of the Church of Christ.

To depart from this historic position; to allow any claims of catholic authority or interpretation to deprive churchmen of liberal or inclusive conviction of the right, with the full authoritative sanction of this Church, to express their conviction individually and collectively would be to reduce the comprehensiveness of this Church down to the limits of a school of thought, and would brand her, in the face of the world crisis, as a separated sect, cut off by her insistence upon liberty and true catholicity from the Church of Rome, and by her exclusive claims from conference and co-operation with Protestant Christianity.

While it is not asked that any legislation should be enacted forbidding those who hold these exclusive views from retaining them, and acting in accordance with them, so far as conference and co-operative relationship with Protestant communions is concerned; it is asked, and insisted, that this Church shall not

consent to legislate, or give official pronouncement that shall restrain the inherent liberty and cherished conviction of others, whose loyalty and devotion to the Church is unquestioned, in the light of her historic position, and in the presence of her authoritative standards as they honestly and unequivocally understand and interpret them.

The point to be clearly borne in mind is, that to legislate, *requiring* all to confer and co-operate with those not of this communion, would be to give the authoritative interpretation and sanction of this Church to the liberal and inclusive view of the Church, and would be unfair to those who hold other views; while, on the other hand, to refuse permission and deny the right of those who desired to enter into conference and co-operative relationship with protestant communions to do so with her sanction, would be to give official endorsement to the position and views and contentions of the extreme, often called catholic, party in the Church.

If this Church remains fully possessed of a

sound mind and a well-balanced judgment, she will persistently refuse to legislate to *require* or *compel* to co-operate or confer with other communions those who cannot consistently do so. She will also persistently refuse to withhold her official consent from those who desire such conference and co-operative liberty.

CHAPTER XVI

THE APPEAL TO THE PAST

IT can be conclusively shown that every disputed dogma, taught and held by the Church, and authorised as a note of catholicity, can be established by quotations from the ancient fathers, or the ancient councils. From similar sources the contrary propositions can also be conclusively established. This statement is true, for instance, of the doctrine of transubstantiation, or of any interpretation of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. It is true of the doctrine of priestly absolution, and of various interpretations of the apostolic succession, and of the growing claims of the papacy. The ancient fathers were far from being of one mind. Nothing is gained

in controversy by quoting from them upon a point in question, if it is intended by this method to establish the contention that a certain interpretation has been always, and by all men, held upon any subject where the effort has been made to explain how the Christ is present in anything human and material. The fact of His presence may be established historically as constant in the faith of the Church. The method of His presence, and the *how* of His communication of Himself evidently perplexed the minds of the fathers as it has the minds of the children of the third and fourth and all succeeding generations.

If propositions exactly contrary may be (as they surely can be) proven by quotations from the Fathers, then what conclusive service may they render to the Church perplexed with the problem of knowing what to authorise and decree as being binding upon the conscience, and essential in the practice of the Church?

They may render valuable service. Their

voices would seem, all unconscious to the ancient fathers themselves, to blend in an appeal for liberty of interpretation, for liberty of practice, and for an inclusive Church. After the contenders for a certain interpretation or practice have filled pages with certain sure quotations from the ancient writings in proof of their view, and have established it upon this ground beyond question, then let the contrary interpretation be stated, and call the fathers. The same ones may not come. (Sometimes they will.) But others with hair as white, and with forms as venerable, and with names as highly honoured, will appear out of the dim past and give testimony that will fill just as many pages proving the contrary theory or practice as the case may be. What then? Shall we slay the fathers of the contrary view as the Church slew the ancient prophets and the Christ? Or shall we learn from them the necessity of making the Church comprehensive of varied interpretations and practices, so long as Christ is honoured, worshipped, revealed and served as

the divine Saviour of men and the ever-living Head of His Body, the Church.

Shall we not learn from them the futility of seizing the ray of light reflected from the mental angle of the party mind and formulating it into a dogma, and labelling it the sun? Shall we not learn that the light of eternal truth reflects itself from many angles?

If it should be answered that truth does not shine both dark and light; the reply is that while this is true, yet many truth-seekers, or truth-holders, are unfortunately colour blind. To God they may be both alike. We had better wait and see. In the darkness of the night He hath set many stars, and some of them are to us still invisible. Truth is vaster than the heavens, and extends beyond the stars. Let us, at least, leave loopholes in our battlements of thought. It were better to build watch towers and place in them far-seeing men to tell us of the night, what its signs of promise are.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ANCIENT PATHS

SURELY no man, no matter how progressive his mind may be in its tendencies, will despise the ancient paths. In them have walked the saints of all ages. The truth we have inherited has come to us from those who walked in them. Along the way are the footprints of priests and prophets, and the blood-stains of martyrs. Along the way are the ancient cathedrals where the spirit of praise and devotion has wrought itself into poems of rhythmic stone. Down these corridors come the harmonies of music chanted in glorious song. If we listen we may hear blended in these symphonies the voices of God's angels. Over these paths have passed the great confessors. The ancient

creeds have come this way. Along them have passed the truth-seekers of the ages, and as they passed they have set up stones which mark the progress of the clearer revelation of God to the heart and mind of humanity. The ancient paths are the source of our heritage. They mark the continuity of truth and of human experience through the ages. They reveal the links "that bind the generations each to each." The ancient paths are the paths of the ever-coming Christ.

But He has not finished His advent. The Christmas message was not a history alone but a revelation of a way opened from heaven to all men, at all times, everywhere. Pentecost illumined not alone the beginning of the ancient path, but gave the revelation of His perpetual presence who should be with His Church unto the end of the world to "guide us into all truth."

The ancient path will grow longer and more ancient as time goes on. In it we are not called to walk backward, though as we walk forward

we should pause often to look backward, and learn from those who have climbed the steep ascent through peril, toil and woe. Though of the past, their spirits go before the pilgrims of to-day. We follow in their train. We reverently and humbly learn of them what they learned of Christ, and are enriched by the testimony of their experience and their realisation of the presence of God.

It is for us of the present to determine how the path of an ancient life and truth, and yet of an ever-living Lord, "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," shall run through the present, and be directed to the future. The Church marks the way. Christ leads the way. Shall not all those who own Him as their Lord, and follow Him, be comprehended in our conception of it? Shall our theories and our demands be made so exclusive and narrow as to force into by-paths many whom He leads? Some of these by-paths are, as the years lengthen into centuries, becoming ancient paths also. And along them are to be found memorials which are cherished

in the memories not alone of the children of those who passed this way to the open gates of Paradise, but of all who have souls sufficiently great to honour heroism and to appreciate the glow which hallowed the lives of these saints of God, departed by what some would still call sectarian by-pathways. Do we not need a new survey and a more comprehensive conception of the Church which we assert is the accredited way to heaven? Should not the Church be as comprehensive as is the Christ who is the ever-living way?

It would doubtless come to pass that, as a result of the sympathy and understanding which would inevitably grow out of closer fellowship, the non-conformist Churches would come to a deeper appreciation of the value of giving to the faith they hold and the truth they teach the added authority which comes from the witness of its unbroken historic survival and continuity through the centuries back to the life and teaching of Christ and His holy apostles.

CHAPTER XVIII

INDIVIDUALISM

TERMS which contain an idea expressive of power and vitality often come, in the use of them, to be terms of reproach and of obloquy. It is usually the "*ism*" at the end that has in it the sting. The "*ism*" is generally the result of the distortion and perversion of the thought or possibility of power which the term originally expressed. The individual has ever been the chief concern of Christ. The parables of the lost sheep and the prodigal son, the discourses which He held with individual men and women, His methods of personal approach, and the expressions in His teaching which tell of God's love and care for a human soul, show how priceless, in His estimation, was

the life of the individual man. It is in the individual that we find the distinctive elements of personality which reveal the kinship of man with God. Yet distinctness and force of personality, and a full measure of personal liberty, are not incompatible with unity. In the Blessed Trinity three Persons have ever existed in the unity of the Godhead.

Individualism is personality run riot. In the life of the Church we sometimes hear it said that it is unwise and inexpedient for an individual or a party to advance ahead of the corporate body. To insist upon this restriction would result in suppressing the thought and energy of the scout who has ever been the pathfinder of truth. It is doubtless well to caution the pioneer of the danger of going too far ahead of the corporate body, but the liberty of scouting ahead in thought and action should be encouraged rather than censured by the Church.

The individual, however, should be taught that the success and permanent worth of his

endeavour as a seeker after truth and an experimenter in the great laboratory of experience, will be determined by his ability to contribute his ideas to the permanent inclusiveness and solidarity of the corporate Body. The pioneer tries the ground ahead. He tests truth in new fields of action. It is true that he is exposed to peril. He is between two fires. He is a mark for the enemy of the truth, and is apt to draw upon himself the fires of its defenders. He is often the martyr of history. He is almost sure to be branded as a heretic, and sometimes has to wait until centuries after he is dead before the thought of the world reaches the point where he fell. Then it may happen that the Church will mark the triumph of her own intelligence by canonising the dead heretic as a saint. This has been the path along which many of the saints have achieved their place in the canon. The Church is slow to learn and often too quick to speak. She has to take many things back. This is hard to do. It is a confession of error and of mistake. The institu-

tion that has made much of its infallibility is apt to be reluctant to acknowledge the mistakes of its past. If larger liberty had been given to individuals and parties to try out new ideas, to test the prophet's vision, and to make experiment with the enthusiasm of initiative, this Church might have kept within her fold many who have done vast good outside of it.

In doing this the Church should not be considered as endorsing the idea or experiment because she allows it. Again, the principle of her thought, and the attitude of her mind, should be: "Let these men alone. If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God" (Acts v, 38 and 39).

CHAPTER XIX

THE HORNS OF A DILEMMA

"LETTERS to the Editor" are very illuminating documents. Most of us have written them on some subject of controversy which was engaging the attention of the Church. Sometimes in sober thoughtfulness we have repented having done it. We have wondered if the attention of the Church might not perhaps have been better directed in more vital and helpful channels. Especially have we thought this after attending some great missionary meeting, or after having received clearer and more far-reaching vision through the appeal and inspiration of the Holy Communion. Then there has come to us the consolation that perhaps they had not absorbed the attention of the Church very much after all.

Nevertheless, "Letters to the Editor" are, at times, very illuminating. Among other things they frequently illumine the bounds of mental vision and the scope of human sympathy. Sometimes they show these bounds to be very narrow. Sometimes they reveal ranges of truth beyond the bounds of partisan interpretation. These letters encourage us to read others in the hope of finding more like them. Perhaps that is why the "Letters to the Editor" are read to a degree to justify the space they occupy in our Church papers.

"Letters to the Editor" have an accustomed way of seeking, without due ceremony or apology, to throw us unconditionally upon either one or the other of the two sharp-pointed horns of a dilemma. The truth, it is said, must be either this or that. In the last number of one of our Church papers we are informed that "the Church either does or does not believe that the priest has power to give absolution." The writer insists that the Church should say whether he has or has not.

We are informed that the Church either does or does not believe in the "real presence" of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and that the Church should say whether she does or does not.

We are told that the doctrine of the apostolic succession is either true, or that it is not; and that the Church should declare her interpretation.

The necessity for all this is stated in the claim set forth that in the Church there should be but one voice, one view and an unbroken uniformity of teaching on each and every one of these points, and on every other question upon which, at present, divergent views prevail.

The Church very wisely allows divergent views to prevail. If she sought to fasten any vital truth to either one or the other of the two horns of the dilemma, she would, in many instances, crucify again the truth itself. She would certainly drive from her fold many seekers after truth.

If she insisted upon giving to any or all of

these questions the answer of an unconditional "Yes," and demanded that her ministry should sign certain articles of interpretation, in which the high priestly sacerdotal view upon these questions was asserted as being the only view which might be held and taught, she would, for instance, exclude from her ministry the large majority of the graduates of the Virginia Seminary, and many of the graduates of Philadelphia, Cambridge, and of other Church divinity schools. Had this been done, the service rendered at home and in foreign lands by these men would, of necessity, have had to be rendered outside of her fold.

If, on the other hand, she gave in answer an unconditional "No," and required subscription to articles in which the high priestly and sacerdotal claims were denied and repudiated, most of the graduates of the General, of Faribault, Nashotah, and many of the graduates of other seminaries would have been, and would now be, excluded from the ministry of this Church.

Would writers of "Letters to the Editor"

really wish to force men to either the one alternative or the other with the necessary resulting consequences?

Upon such horns may be hung men's hats, and men's scalps, but not the brains and hearts of vital, loving, conscientious Churchmen, who see the truth from different viewpoints, who teach it with varied emphasis, and who sometimes see gleams of it in both the "Yes" and the "No" of the paradoxes stated in the "Letters to the Editor."

Unless we are really determined to make the Church less catholic than she now is, we should resolutely refuse to delimit her comprehensiveness by seeking to give the exclusive sanction of authority, or of official interpretation, to those notes of conviction voiced in the letters of exclusive and partisan contention. The writers of these letters would make the colour of loyalty so vivid, and so clearly defined, and so lurid that there could be no shadings of colour away from it or into it. In this event, the Church would become a doctrinal paintshop,

or, at most, a formal gallery of ecclesiastical art of one school of painters.

Truth has ever refused to be so portrayed. Vital and eternal, she gleams and glows and shines in and through the souls of men, and reflects her light from many angles of many minds. As the sun glows in myriad colours from the snow-capped Alps, made refulgent with sunset glory; shimmers in varied hues upon the forest leaves, and on the limpid lake, and colour-changing sea; as its light is reflected in the tinted bloom of every flower, in the pale radiance of the moonlight, and in the golden gleam of the stars; even so is the light of truth refulgent in and reflected from the thought and spiritual experience of man. As one star differeth from another star in glory, even so differ the gleams of truth, which come from the minds of men.

But surely truth is too vital, and too precious, and too divine to be stereotyped and delimited to the narrow bounds of an interpretative "Yes" or "No," as is often insisted upon

in the "Letters to the Editor." If the Church is to edit truth, let the Church, for the truth's sake, and for man's sake, edit it largely, and not copyright the edition for all time. If she is to set up sign posts along the way of truth to point men heavenward, let "the way" be indicated by the straight arm of a cross pointing to the path marked by the footprints of the Son of Man. But let there not be set in the way of truth the theories of men to be the authoritative guide-posts along the way that leadeth to truth and to life. "The way" is the way of life. It is a narrow way, but it is wider than many of the more narrow and exclusive interpretations of human thought.

CHAPTER XX

THE PARADOXES OF TRUTH

BECAUSE of the fact that truth is eternal and cannot be fully comprehended in positive or negative statements made by, or comprehended by, the human mind, the great teachers of truth have often spoken in paradoxes. The negative and the affirmative of a proposition have been stated with perfect fearlessness of seeming contradiction, and with entire disregard of seeming inconsistency. This method of stating or of suggesting the scope of truth shows that the teacher recognises the inadequacy of human reason to comprehend its limits, and to define its bounds. This method was often used by the Great Teacher, who was Himself the eternal Truth. "No man," He said,

"hath seen the Father:" "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "I can of my own self do nothing:" "All power is given unto me." "I go my way to Him that sent me:" "Lo I am with you always." "This is my Body" and "My flesh is meat indeed:" "The flesh profiteth nothing." "I seek not mine own glory:" "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." "Not my will but thine be done:" "I and my Father are one." These are but a few illustrations of His frequent use of the paradoxical method of teaching.

The natural mind, the material and therefore skeptical and superficial thought, has ever seen in such paradoxical statements irreconcilable contradictions. The soul that feels God, and knows Him in experience, knows that He cannot be fully known. The spirit-illumined mind realises that truth is found in paradoxes, but sees that in the impossibility of finding it fully expressed in either one paradox or the other, lies the proof that the finite mind cannot

by either a negative or positive assertion contain and express what is infinite.

From the vast conception and reverence for truth, seen in the Master's use of the paradox as a teaching method, the Church might well learn in larger measure to refrain from forcing truth upon either one or the other of the horns of a dilemma, and from insisting, through the voice of any party within her fold, that what is eternal in its nature and relationship should be delimited into narrow and exclusive doctrinal or interpretational expressions, set forth with the sanction of a binding authority.

CHAPTER XXI

THE CENTRAL GROUND POSITION

IT cannot be expected that all will occupy this position. It is, however, necessary that it should be strongly occupied, not alone for the defence of the truth held by those who maintain the position, but also for the defence of those who occupy either one or the other of the extreme positions. Without the holders of the central ground, the positions of both extremes would, from time to time, become untenable. The occupants of the extreme positions are exclusive, and are apt to be partisan. Jealous of their own rights, logically convinced that they are the chosen champions of the Church, without whom she would cease to exist, they are ever prone to aggressive warfare.

They are disposed to be intolerant of the rights and privileges of those from whom they differ. They see no reason or justice in the demand for the central ground. They say it is an unworthy, compromise position. The Church, they say, must be either catholic or protestant. Choose ye which.

The Church faces no such necessity. She has never, even during the time of Christ, or during the life of the apostles, or at any time during her history, been exclusively the one or the other. She has ever been, and must ever be, protestant against all error, in order that she may be catholic and inclusive of all truth.

Those occupying the central ground are not appealing in any sense for a *via media* compromise settlement. The sacrifice of conviction to a compromise level is not asked, because such a sacrifice would be unworthy and weak.

The contention of those of the central ground is that the Church should be made and kept comprehensive. When the extreme high party would seek to impose upon the whole Church

their theories of orders based upon an exclusive interpretation of the apostolic succession, those of the central position become earnestly protestant, and intensely catholic. They protest against contentions which brand those who do not accept these interpretations as "disloyal," "traitors" and "the friends of schismatics." They become ardently catholic in their appeal for the love that thinketh no evil, and for the claim of a Church comprehensive enough for both a Bishop Brooks and the Bishop of Fond Du Lac.

When, on the other hand, the extreme low party will hear nothing of priests and apostolic succession claims, and ancient catholic practices repudiated in the Reformation settlement, and would fain force these brethren into Rome, calling them "apists" and covenant breakers, then the party of the central ground again becomes both protestant and catholic and pleads for a stay of execution. These men, they say, are sincere and devoted. They stand by the stake which they consider essential to

the survival of the tabernacle, and keep hammering it firmly in the ground. Let them alone. You, who are interested in lengthening the cords, and stretching the wing of the tent, will find some day that the strong pole at the centre, which these men have guarded and hammered in by tradition, and syllogism, and devotion, has given you something rooted and grounded in the past to tie to. You are essential to each other. Conservatism and enthusiasm; the ecclesiastic and the progressive, are not of necessity enemies. They are essentially dependent. It is a question, after all, of emphasis, of conviction, of liberty.

We have often recalled the assertion made by the scholarly and devoted Lord Bishop of Kingston, who remarked that "the low and evangelical churchman seemed more successful in winning men for Christ and His Church, and the high churchman seemed more successful in holding on to them; and the Church needed them both." He then quietly observed, that "he wished they would stop fighting each

other, because in this they did the Church much harm in every way.''

That which gives to the holders of the central position their strength and influence is the fact that this class is composed of men representing all schools of thought in the Church. The extreme high, low, ritualistic, and broad churchman, are all found represented among those who, while tenacious of their views and convictions, are yet men of sufficient breadth of sympathy and of comprehensiveness of thought to stand together in their contention for a Church that shall be inclusive of widely divergent views, so long as there is a loyal devotion to Christ, and to the spiritual conception of the Church as the Body of Christ.

They recognise that the triumph of either extreme wing of the Church would spell disaster, and would inevitably result in turning the Church into a school of thought, or in degrading her to the level of a sect.

CHAPTER XXII

THE LANGUAGE OF COURTESY AND OF CONTROVERSY

THE term "the Church" is used with varied significance by the same men under different circumstances. In conferences where men of different communions are gathered, it is applied, by courtesy, to all who, having been baptised, profess and call themselves Christians, even by men who, in Church paper controversy, and in their own pulpit utterances, apply it to the organisation of the apostolic succession alone, using the words "denominations," "sectarians," "our enemies," and "our opponents" as descriptive of those who "are not of the Church." It is a question as to when these men are at their best. We do not pre-

sume to lay the invidious charge of inconsistency against them. It is better that men should be inconsistent and liberal sometimes, than consistently narrow all the time. It is, however, significant that the mind, when brought into the atmosphere of a common spiritual experience, should use the term "the Church" in a comprehensive sense, even though it confines the term to the limits of a logical exclusiveness when in the controversial mood.

A MATTER OF EMPHASIS

There is no question but that in the Anglican Church, and in this Church in America, the question of the interpretation of the ordinal is the crucial question which lies back of practically every controversy that claims any measure of public attention regarding the Church and her divine and human relationships. Controversies relative to sacraments, pulpit exchange, conferences, co-operation, and terminology, all have their root in this ultimate question of the regularity and validity of or-

ders. At times one would imagine, from what is written by way of interpretation, that Christ came into the world to preserve the apostolic succession of the ministry, so insistent and violent are the assertions made on the subject. If there are no sacraments without the Church, and no Church without the unbroken succession of order, and no covenant of salvation without sacraments, then well might the Christ have lived and died for the establishment and preservation of the succession. This is not, however, where the emphasis is placed in the great Gospel of Redemption; nor is it where the emphasis is placed in the rest of the New Testament literature. That a succession was intended, and is clearly implied, and was begun, and began to be continued, there is evidence. But that it was to be made the test of loyalty of men to their Lord, or to supersede this mark and token of their membership in His Body, is not taught in Sacred Scripture. Indeed, the contrary teaching is clearly indicated, if not implicitly given.

The exclusive theory of the succession may be applied as a test to ascertain the regularity of orders according to this standard. It were almost sacrilegious to demand it as a condition of a valid ministry in the Church of Christ. He gives His clear and visible tokens that this irregular ministry is valid for the purpose of building men into His Body. And this is surely His chief concern. His will that men should be saved takes precedence over the form in which the Church that helps save them is constituted. The essential and vital union of the souls of men with Him, as Saviour, is the question of prime importance with reference to the Church, which is His Body.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE FENCE THROUGH THE MIDDLE GROUND

IF these words, which are but the feeble effort to express a sincere conviction of what we earnestly believe is a true and loyal conception of a comprehensive and catholic Church, should perchance come to the attention of extreme men of either the high or low school of thought in the Church, we apprehend that the charge will be made that, in contending for comprehensiveness, we have straddled the fence upon every proposition considered. The charge is doubtless true. But who had the right to build a fence right across the middle ground of our inheritance as the children of God? Who has the right to run a hard and fast line through

the middle of the Kingdom of God and say that the true conception of the Church lies exclusively on one side of that thought line, or on the other? What is a man to do but straddle the line when he finds it there, when he believes in his heart that the truth is on both sides of it? After all, if charges must needs be made, do they not lie more against the fence builders than against those who are forced to climb and sit on the fence in order that they may see the far reaches of the fields of truth? But let those who straddle the line straddle it widely and not stand fast upon it as a *via media* of their own making or choice. The place on the top of the fence should never be chosen as a compromise position, but as a vantage point of wider vision.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE PRIEST AND THE MONK

AS we considered these two pilgrims who, among others, were passing in review through the present, we asked, does the Church need them? Is there room for them in this Church? The extreme partisan of the low Church party would doubtless answer, "No. They antedate the Reformation. They savour strongly of sacerdotalism. They hold views for which we find no warrant in the Book of Common Prayer. Let them go to Rome." There are still among Protestants those who would consider that, in saying this, they were consigning the monk and the priest to perdition. There are wide ranges of conviction concerning things ecclesiastical among those who profess and call

themselves Christian, but who call their brethren by names which must sound wonderfully pleasing to the ears of the Devil.

The question which faces us relative to the need and the place for the priest and the monk is not as to whether the sacerdotal views of the one, or the mediæval customs of the other, square with the standards of this branch of the Catholic Church as they now stand printed in the Prayer Book, and in the constitution of the Church. They themselves being the judges, it is admitted that they do not. Their protest against the reformation, their appeal to ancient catholic custom, their use of ritual ceremonial and vestments which are not sanctioned by any authority which this Church, since the Reformation, has decreed and set forth, is proof of the fact that present standards and interpretations are not, to their minds and to their tastes, sufficiently comprehensive. In saying this, we are sure we do these men no injustice. It is our understanding of their position from what they themselves assert and do. Their

right to do these things in the light of existing standards is a question of conscience upon which the writer is not called to sit in judgment.

The question of vital importance is:—What shall be the policy and attitude of this Church to the sacerdotal priest and the monk in the days and years which lie ahead of us? It is neither right nor wise to leave them standing in suspense before the bar of conscience. It is well neither for them, nor for bishops, charged with the responsibility of discipline, that views so widespread and practices so generally observed should seem to be in violation of the expressed law, or if not so, in opposition to the practices and principles authoritatively sanctioned.

It is always dangerous, and frequently manifestly unfair, to present alternatives of choice as though they presented the only possible solution of a problem.

It would seem, however, in answer to this question of the duty and responsibility of the

Church, that one of three alternatives faces us.

In the first place, if the radical contentions of the low Church partisan should prevail, this other extreme party would be turned over to Rome. But they do not desire to be turned over to Rome. They may hope that the time may come when the term catholic will not be hyphenated either with Roman or with Protestant. They may desire and help hasten the time when Roman and Eastern Catholicism may prove acceptable and congenial to them, or when they may absorb the Roman or the Eastern Church, or both.

But, as they stand to-day, and as Rome stands to-day, they are not in agreement. They, therefore, cannot be, nor should they be, forced to accept Roman Catholicism as a choice between two evils. They would doubtless prefer to bear what they consider the evils of the Church to which they belong, as it now is, rather than be forced to fly to other evils that they know of full well.

In the second place, if denied what they be-

lieve to be their catholic liberty, they may feel constrained to ultimately form a new old Catholic Church. The expression a "new Catholic Church" is, of course, contradictory, and the expression "old Catholic Church" is tautological. But everything ecclesiastical seems in these days to be involved in contradictions. The erection of "the Catholics" in the Church into a Church apart, called by whatever name might be chosen, would be a possibility, but it would not seem to be a step away from schism, or a step toward a closer unity in the already fragmentated Body of Christ. But if the choice has to be made, as we are told it must be made, between protestant and catholic, then it must be made by those who insist upon its being made, and who fail to see that the Church, or a large section of it, will insist upon remaining protestant in order that they may remain catholic in keeping with the historic position, which many will continue to believe is the catholic position of the Church.

The third alternative lies in the hope and

possibility of making this Church comprehensive, and much more than tolerantly comprehensive, of all schools of spiritually minded thought within the Church.

If this is to be brought to pass, there must of necessity be some very large-minded and far-reaching thinking done by all who are concerned. Concessions that are costly will have to be made. Clear distinctions will have to be drawn between things spiritual and formal, and between facts and theories. Positions which may seem contradictory, because they are opposites, must be admitted possible of tenure in the effort to test out their truth in the realm of human experience. When what is cherished as precious truth by some, seems darksome error to others, then again the attitude of the opposition must be, "Let these men alone. If this doctrine is of man, it will be brought to naught; if it be of God, beware lest ye be found to fight against God." The judgments of the mind must be made in the consciousness of the presence of God, Who is Eternal Truth, and Who, in the

course of time, will vindicate Himself. The deductions of the limited and finite minds of controversialists will not be taken as though they were the oracles of God. They will be examined candidly and given the consideration which the thought of one sincere man deserves at the bar of another man's judgment. Terms of an unbrotherly kind will not be hurled through the press and from the battlements of Church papers, and from pistols pointed over the editor's desk. "Mr. Editor" will not be asked to call the man who does not agree with the writer a "traitor," or a "schismatic." Such terms will not be used of priests of the Church, not yet deposed, by those who would themselves wish to be considered possessed of the virtues of a Christian man, or the common decency which becomes the character of a gentleman.

The priest and the monk should be given ample room in the comprehensiveness of the Church of the future. The terms of their tenure of office and position and conviction should

be made certain, and the settlement should be liberal and widely inclusive.

The priest and the monk should, however, be brought to clearly understand that the liberty that is to them allowed is not assented to in a way that makes their liberty a law of conformity for the whole Church. They must be brought to see very clearly that no matter how firm their convictions may be, they are included in the comprehensiveness of the Church which also comprehends other views. The legislation which gives the larger liberty should be expressed by the word *"May,"* and not by the word *"Must."*

If, to this end, those who occupy the middle ground shall agree to endeavour to make the Church comprehensive of the sacerdotal priest and the monk, and to sanction the existence and work of inner shrine sacred orders, then the priest and the monk must also agree that those of the middle ground shall also be left free to seek to make the Church inclusive of the prophet and placed on conference terms with the protes-

tant ministry not of this Church, and brought at times, and under pre-accepted conditions, into co-operative relationship with any who are of the Body of Christ through the sacrament of baptism.

CHAPTER XXV

THE PROPHET AND THE NONCONFORMIST MINISTER

IF there be those in the comprehensive Church of the future who shall desire to hear the message of some prophet of God, not of the ministry of this Church, liberty must be given that this message may be proclaimed and judged, as every message is, upon its merit, and in view of its harmony with eternal truth.

If there be those then, as there are those now, who desire freely to invite other Christians to the Holy Communion of this Church, their liberty to do so must be granted. Their contention that no theory or interpretation should be set as a barrier to prevent any child of the Father who has openly confessed his faith in

Christ as his personal Saviour from receiving the strengthening and refreshing of his soul by coming to the Communion when he feels himself called there by the Spirit of Christ, must be freely granted and allowed.

If there shall be those who desire to participate in the future in such communions as the one which gave rise to the Kikuyu controversy, their liberty to do so must be allowed.

If there should be those who, in response to a spiritual conviction, feel disposed to attend the communion of a non-conformist Church, the sacerdotal priest and the monk must agree to assent that, while they could never do such a thing (and, of course, they would never be asked to), yet the liberty of the priest or layman who can, with conscience, do so must be by the whole Church allowed. This would by no means imply that the whole Church sanctioned and assented to a parity of orders. It would mean this no more than it would mean that the whole Church assented to the doctrine of masses for the dead because it per-

mitted those who did believe in them to have communions memorial of the souls of the faithful departed.

The principle here contended for is that the whole Church may unanimously agree to permit the expression of conviction on the part of those who constitute a minority, and whose views and convictions in no way represent the convictions of the majority.

THE OBJECTION

The sacerdotal priest and the monk may be strongly disposed to object that it would be asking too much for them to agree to such a procedure as this. Would not our assent to such comprehensiveness as that suggested invalidate the very fundamental principle of succession upon which the Church is founded? By no means. This Church in America has never expressed its mind on this subject. It has never formulated a theory of the succession. It says very clearly what is required of

those who are to be accounted ministers in and of "this Church." It says nothing as to who are to be accounted ministers *by* this Church.

For the Church as a whole to make herself inclusive of those who would hold fellowship, conference, and even communion, with those not of this Church, would be neither to sanction nor to repudiate any doctrine of the apostolic succession. It would simply be to accord to those who place upon this doctrine a major emphasis and hold it absolutely essential, the liberty to hold their respective convictions, and the right to express them. If the General Convention should, by a majority vote, order that all its members *should* attend a joint communion with the Presbyterian General Assembly, or of necessity go as delegates to Panama or Rome, then convictions would be sacrificed upon the altar of tyranny by the power of a majority.

But for the Church as a whole to legislate for the full liberty of any part of it, even though that part be but a minority, does in no way, and to no degree whatsoever, commit the

Church as a whole to the view of that minority or majority, as the case may be, as being the exclusive position held on the question by the whole Church.

CHAPTER XXVI

NECESSARY RESTRICTIONS UPON LIBERTY

LIBERTY is unbounded in the realms of eternal truth, because eternal truth is unbounded. It is, however, contradicted by error. In human thought the possibilities of error are inherent by reason of the finite nature of the human mind. Neither one of two propositions is necessarily wholly wrong because they appear logically contradictory and exclusive of each other. Some truth may inhere in each proposition. It often happens that the contradiction arises out of the inadequacy of a statement to include all the elements of truth, and all the facts of experience which it assumes to comprehend and explain. Within the wide

realms of truth, the seeker after it should be allowed the widest possible liberty. It should also be allowed that ample room and full scope should be given in the Church to test various aspects of truth in the realm of experience.

The Church, however, must set certain bounds to the thinking process, and to the practice which is to prevail with her sanction, in order that the integrity of truth may not be confused with the disintegrating power of the error which is distinctly contrary to the essence of the truth which she holds, and to which she bears witness.

The necessity for such restriction is seen in connection with the liberty which is to be allowed by the Church to every school of thought within her fold.

RATIONALISM VERSUS THEISM

The Church may well be not only tolerant but vitally sympathetic with the efforts of human reason to comprehend and corre-

late the truth; she may insist that views that seem logically contradictory may still be inclusive of truth, and comprehended within the sphere of truth, which may embrace both conceptions, and much more than both conceptions suggest or contain. When, however, reason presumes to deny that which the Church exists to affirm; when reason asserts that there is nothing beyond what reason sees, and proclaims that all possible phenomena which are worthy of credence must be shown to conform to the laws which the mind has already apprehended; when reason denies the supernatural, and insists upon reducing the content of revelation to the test of the physical laboratory, or to the measure of natural law, as it has been generalised and formulated by material science; and then proceeds upon this basis to deny the miraculous, and to repudiate supernatural revelation: then it becomes the duty of the Church, in her defence of the truth, to protest against these unwarranted assumptions of the natural mind, which have no warrant for their validity,

either in the realm of science, or in the realms of spiritual experience. For her to embrace and tolerate teaching which positively denies or insidiously undermines the essence and nature of the spiritual truth which she holds as being supernatural and as transcending material laws and rational speculation, would be to assert that she had no distinctive mission. To be comprehensive of the error which denies the essence of the truth of which she is set to be the witness, would be to forfeit her claim to having been sent from God to witness to a revelation in human experience which transcends the bounds of human reason. She may be tolerant of reverent agnosticism; she may be tolerant of reverent skepticism in its search for truth, as Christ was tolerant of the doubt of Thomas; and she may be tolerant of many theories which seek to grasp and explain the supernatural, even though these theories may appear contradictory. She cannot, however, tolerate, and be comprehensive of, the error which cuts the very roots of the tree of life

which she has been set to water and tend, that it and its fruits may be for the healing of the nations.

MATERIALISM VERSUS SPIRITISM

In the midst of a material world the Church of God has been set to be the sacramental sign and witness of the spirit world that lies back of, and at the foundation of, things visible and temporary. It is now, and doubtless always will be, quite impossible for the finite mind to harmonise completely and to state adequately the exact relation and perfect balance of the interrelation between form and spirit. The material is the sacrament of the spiritual. It is the outward and visible manifestation of an inward and spiritual reality. Life in and under and through the material form presents itself in us, and to us, in all our divine and human relationship, as it does in our personal experience. This fact constitutes the basis of the sacramental system and ritual practice of the Church. That minds should differ as to the

value and need and extent to which the sacramental and ritual element in the life of the Church should be emphasised, is natural, and evidential of the fact that the Church comprehends within herself many temperaments of soul, and many types of mind. The Church, if she is wise in her day and generation, will so order the bounds of her comprehensive sympathy as to embrace the personalities which are appealed to, and would make their appeal through symbol and sacrament, and who would use both largely as means for communicating divine life and imparting the truth as to the divine nature. She will also provide for making at home within her fold those to whom emphasised form and ceremony is an obstacle and hindrance to spiritual vision, and who instinctively desire a more immediate approach to God than is provided in a ritualistic service.

She must, however, set bounds upon them both in the liberty which she allows. These limitations should rest not so much in things prohibited as in safeguarding the fundamental

principles which it is her duty to guard and maintain.

The Church may be ritualistic and yet intensely spiritual. There are many personalities so constituted that they could not have grown so distinctly spiritual if they had not been aided by ritual observances in their approach to God. The Church, however, is the one institution in this world set to bear witness to the Spirit in the midst of things material. If she becomes materialistic, she forfeits her right to bear witness. If she stoops to be flesh in order to win the spirit, she loses her chance, and becomes of the world, which she can no longer save. When the Church substitutes the material for the spiritual, she transcends by such transubstantiation her power, her right, her liberty and the law of her life. The Eternal Son came down, and for us men and our salvation, was made flesh, and in the form of our humanity, dwelt among us, but this He did that He might exalt our nature and make us sons of God, and

partakers with Him of the divine nature. He did not materialise Himself. He spiritualised the humanity in which He became incarnate. He took our nature upon Him, then through sacrifice, and the resurrection and His glorious ascension He took it into the eternal Trinity, and into eternal atonement with God. The Church must restrict the liberty of mind which ventures to controvert or deny the truth inherent in, and revealed through the incarnation. She cannot suffer those within her fold to substitute something material for the living and ascended and ever-present Christ. She may and does allow men to exalt the sacrament, and she permits them to hold many and varied theories as to how, in the sacrament, He is, or may be present. She denies men the liberty of substituting a material thing for the sacrament. For, she says, in doing this, you overthrow the very nature of the sacrament itself. The Church not only has the right, but the duty, to guard the integrity of truth. It may not be wise for her to insist upon the acceptance of any

theory as to *how* Christ is present in the sacrament. When men take the consecrated elements and say that these are no longer in any sense material elements, as your senses would lead you to think, but these are Christ; this material substance is your very Lord, outwardly present, and here to be gazed upon and exalted on the altar, here to be reserved that the altar may be sanctified by His presence when you are gone, to be carried about as a Christ corporal, a Christ that can be put into a silver box, and preserved there to be communicated afterward; this the Church says she cannot understand, and this theory of His presence she has repudiated. The Church may, perhaps, allow those whose minds admit such a materialised conception individually to hold it. The Church has the right and the duty to restrict her authorised ministers from teaching this to her children. This she has done. Once in her articles of religion, she repudiated this teaching, and forbade it. Immediately subsequent to the Reformation, in Jewel's "Apol-

ogy,'' which was set forth by Archbishop Parker, and published with the consent of Convocation, she repudiated this teaching, and since then, she has never, by any official sanction, permitted this, which she regards as error, to be included within the scope of what she regards as the liberty of teaching permitted to the priesthood of this Church. She insists that the material shall not be substituted for the spiritual. She allows wide liberty of interpretation as to how the material symbol and spiritual and real Presence may both be taken and received by the faithful in the sacrament of His Body and Blood.

It sometimes becomes necessary to restrain the lower in order to develop the higher liberty. When the liberty given to the mind is used to build barriers which confine the spirit; when the liberty given to reason is used to forge chains which shackle faith; when the liberty given to thought results in teaching which undermines the truth of revelation and the facts of divine and human relationship, which

are witnessed to in human experience, and which are cherished as the truths distinctive of the life of faith and devotion; when the liberty of interpretation denies the spiritual conception of truth, and insists upon substituting a material thing for a spiritual heritage,—then the Church, for the sake of souls, for the sake of the faith, and in the name of the truth for which she is the witness, must deny men the liberty to assert that which she cannot include within her comprehensiveness without becoming not only less comprehensive of truth but inclusive of distinctly conflicting error.

This must, therefore, of necessity be her attitude to liberty which results in rationalism and materialism.

CONFORMITY VERSUS LIBERTY

How liberty of conscience and conformity to standards can both be preserved has ever been the hard problem in the life of the Church. The spirit is alive and vital. The form is created

to be its body, its means of expression. The one grows; the other is officially static until, by authority, it is recast. To what extent the spirit of God, to what extent the spirit of worship has been trammelled and delimited by fixedness of form is a question which affords ground for interesting speculation, but which defies positive answer. The value of corporate worship under prescribed forms, the advantage of creating and maintaining through a cherished liturgy the continuity of the spirit of devotion, and the enriching power of association with services long and devotedly used, doubtless overbalance the objection to the limitation of the spirit of worship under the prescribed forms of worship. That the spirit of devotion often transcends and outgrows the forms provided for corporate worship has been the reason which has ever led the way to liturgical enrichment in the Church of God. It is always permissible for men in the Church to feel the need for a larger liberty in liturgical expression. It is also permissible for men to ask

the liberty of expressing their devotion in the corporate life of the Church in a freer expression than prescribed forms will allow. It would be well for the Church to give heed to every reasonable demand which is made upon her by the spirits of men in their desire to worship God in the beauty of holiness, and in the enrichment of form, and in the freedom of spirit. She may well consider the fact that temperaments radically differ, and that wide liberty should be allowed in her devotional formularies and rubrics for the outgoing heart of man in praise, adoration and petition.

The Church which gives to her children the right and the opportunity through due processes of legislation to voice and register their desires and convictions, may reasonably demand and expect that her formulas of devotion will be used, and her rubrics adhered to, pending the time when changes may be asked for and, if reasonable, secured. It should always be hoped that a majority would not deny to a minority of seekers for a closer communion with God the

liberty of any reasonable form and expression of devotion so long as the integrity of her liturgical use is preserved according to her direction.

A spiritually disposed Church, and bishops who are not slaves to the letter, will ever see that any reasonable and spiritually profitable usage is allowed, if by it men's hearts are, without offence to others, more surely and closely brought into communion with God. Uniformity of worship is not nearly so essential to the glory and good of the Church as is a comprehensive system of worship, in and under which men will be obedient to law and submissive to authority. Non-conformity allowed is surely better than ecclesiastical anarchy. Priests who are themselves persistently disobedient to the law of the Church, can hardly, with consistency, insist upon the obedience to parents and others in authority, which is taught in the catechism of the Church. One would think that our Bishops would gladly welcome more comprehensiveness in liturgical usage with

the hope that, as Fathers in God, they would not be troubled with the spirit of persistent disobedience which now characterises so many of their priestly children.

The rule for churchmen with reference to the liturgy might well be:—Contend for liberty if your spirit of devotion feels confined, but obey the law while it lasts. Sometimes the best way to get a law changed is by a mutual agreement to observe it scrupulously. If everybody breaks it, the result is unlicensed non-conformity.

Law and form have always been and always will be essentially related to the survival and expression of the spirit of liberty both in the state and in the Church. License of thought and expression, while they have ever sought to cloak themselves with the garb of liberty, have ever been enemies to the development of the true spirit of freedom.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE PERILS OF PROTESTANTISM

THE student of contemporaneous religious life and thought perceives that the path of progress is beset with perils. The dangers which beset Protestantism are largely of a kind distinctly opposite from those which beset and pervert the mind of the so-called "Catholic party" in the Church. Protestant weaknesses come largely from the over rebound from the exclusive claims and demands of ecclesiasticism. In many instances they arise from wrong, or disproportionate, emphasis upon certain aspects of truth. The Church of the reconstruction should be careful to observe them, and to note the causes which have led men to turn into by-paths, and, at times, to get stuck in snow drifts, or to lose themselves in the wilderness.

INDIVIDUALISTIC SALVATION

The emphasis placed by Protestantism upon the value of the human soul has not been too great. It has, at times, been too exclusive. This has resulted in a certain type of exaggerated individualism. The duty of the member to be in himself sound and spiritually alive has not been correlated with the duty of the member of the Body corporate.

The recognition of this weakness has in some instances led Protestant communions to overemphasise social service as the cure for an individualistic conception of salvation. Social service sends the soul out to find its corporate life in serving social needs. While this fulfills in part the requirement for the expression of the life that has been saved through Christ, it does not make provision for the sure and continued salvation of the life in Christ, which comes from the close incorporation of the individual into His Body through the constant use of the spiritual sacramental system of

the Church. While it is true that the Church exists to save and to help the individual, it is also the duty of the individual to build his personality into the corporate life of the Church, that the Body may, through him, be made more strong for fulfilling its mission, and in order that, through the Body, his own life may daily increase in that spiritual life which, through the Body, is supplied.

LETTING DOWN THE BARS

In the rebound from the Church, cumbered by superadded intensive notes of dogma and ritual, there is the danger of seeking to make the Church so extensive in its comprehension that it will include, by invitation and acceptance, those who do not comply with, because they do not have explained to them, the elemental and essential terms of salvation in and through Jesus Christ. It is possible so completely to rationalise and despiritualise its teaching as to exclude from it the distinctive

and essential notes of its Christian character and divine mission to men. The bars may be let down so low that those who are let in scarcely know whether they are on the inside or on the outside. This is done when men are told that it makes no difference what they believe if they live rightly, as though men could live rightly if they did not first believe aright. This is done when a credal basis for character building is repudiated because, perchance, there have been those who have mistaken, and substituted the intellectual acceptance of credal statements for a vital credal faith. This is done when Christ is debased to the level of the power of the human reason to accept Him, and when, because there is no response of spiritual faith, He is offered as a mere man (God's best man), to the natural mind. The Unitarian may do this and be consistent, the Christian minister cannot do this and be consistent with, or loyal to, the fundamental charter of the Christian Church whose mission is to preach Christ as the divine and incarnate Son of God.

If the Bible has no voice back of it save the voice of man, and no spirit of inspiration save that of human genius; if Christ be naught save an example, if He be relegated to history as the world's greatest hero, and be not proclaimed, as He proclaimed Himself, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, the Son, to whom the weary and heavy laden may come and find salvation and power and peace; if His sacraments are accounted as meaningless ordinances which may be used or dispensed with according to the individual whims of men; and if the Christian ministry be intrusted indiscriminately to any who may desire to take this name and office upon themselves, without having been called, carefully examined, and, by recognised authority, ordained; then the Christian Church will have lost every note of authority, and every distinctive reason for claiming the confidence, the support, and the following of men.

THE MATERIALISED CHURCH

If there be reason to charge that the Episcopal Church lays undue stress and disproportionate emphasis upon her orders, her forms and ceremonies, and her sacramental system, there is, on the other hand, reason to believe that Protestant Churches, not of the Episcopal Order and Communion, frequently obscure the spiritual character and claim of the Church by other exaggerated forms of material ministration. That the Church has a social function to perform, is unquestionably true, and that the element of fellowship in the Episcopal Church is frequently not sufficiently developed and emphasised is true also, but it is equally true that, in the practical administration of many Protestant organisations, the appeal made through the social and material functions of the Church is so over-emphasised as to be in danger of excluding the emphasis upon the distinctive spiritual claims of the Church. The six-day-in-the-week gymnasium, the social clubs,

the incessant supping and dining, the debating societies, the before-service supper and the after-service tea, the special music programme, the advertised Sunday evening concert, the appeal to curiosity through the sensational topic display and the worshipless character of many preaching services, all tend to impress the public mind with the idea that the Church is panic-stricken, that it has lost its faith, its courage and its supreme conviction as to its distinctive mission to witness to the spiritual truth and power of the Kingdom of God. The danger is that many will join the Church because it offers cheaper club and gymnasium and recreation facilities than they could get elsewhere. The excessive material emphasis is not calculated to create spiritual-mindedness. While there are circumstances which unquestionably justify the existence of the institutional Church, it is nevertheless true that the nature of its appeal tends to obscure the spiritual appeal, and constitutes a danger which, at times, rises to a point of peril in Protestant Christianity.

SOCIAL SERVICE AS A THING APART

One of the distinctly vital and encouraging phases of current Church life is the emphasis which is being placed on social service. It is indicative of the recognition by the Church of a large responsibility to serve. It is the manward expression of the Christian consciousness. It is the fulfillment of the second commandment given by our Blessed Lord, enjoining love to our neighbour, who is the other needy child of God.

The danger in this realm of Christian activity lies in the possibility, and in the disposition sometimes seen, to substitute social service for the corporate worship of God. The two duties are not antagonistic. They are complementary to each other. Worship without service becomes formal and impotent. Social service, without the vital background of spiritual experience kept alive through the services and sacraments of the Church, is sure to become mechanical, perfunctory and void of constructive and vitalising

spiritual inspiration. It tends to eliminate the spiritual elements of personal sympathy, and the creative power of faith and love. As an expression of a divinely kindled desire to serve, as the outgoing of the ever-incoming spirit of God, as the translation of the great Gospel of redemption into terms which are understood of men, social service furnishes a great liberating and constructive programme for the manifestation of the spirit of Christ, and is a distinctive and indispensable part of the one great mission of the Church. As a substitute for the worship of God in the services and ordinances of His Church, it is a delusion of a most dangerous kind. Reconstructed life must be built upon eternal foundations, it must be incorporated into the life divine, if it is to be permanent and progressive in the evolution of the social order. There is always grave peril of perverting or distorting an idea, which, when held in its proper relation to God and man, is fraught with vast potency for good.

The greatest Servant of men found, and ever

maintained, the due proportion and proper balance between silence with God and service to men. Worship and work were inseparably bound together in His consciousness of His divine relationship and His human mission.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE PERIL OF ORDERS

THE human mind is ever prone to misuse the great gifts of God. Out of this disposition has grown the idol-worship of the world. The revelation, the instrument, the means, becomes an end itself. The Jews came to worship their temple and their law, and then their idols, and lost the vision of God. Until rebuked and forbidden by them, the superstitious barbarians of Lycaonia would fain have worshipped the apostles. The Roman Church has deified the Virgin, and exalted the pope to a place almost co-equal with Christ. Protestants at times have made the letter of Scripture the pope of Protestantism.

And what have we done? We have empha-

sised the necessity for valid and regular orders. We have exalted the sacramental system of the Church. We have capitalised "The Church." We have glorified the ritual of our worship. We have created what Billy Sunday asserts is the best governed and ordered Church in Christendom. In all this we cannot be fairly charged with having done amiss. But our course has been, and still is, beset with perils. We have not always been mindful of them. We are in constant danger of becoming unmindful of them. The danger lies in making an *end* of what God ordained to be a *means* to an end. We constantly face the peril of becoming slaves to the system that was ordained to make men free.

The peril does not present itself especially to the priestly mind. The danger is not so much that he will become a materialist, though he sometimes does, but that the laity will not see through the form and system to the spiritual verities of which it is intended to be, and really is, the sign and symbol. The form and

ritual, which is intended to project the soul into the spiritual realm, is in danger of arresting the attention and of enchaining the soul to the over-emphasised symbol. The priest has used the organisation in a way to make him recognise it as an organism into which he is incorporated. He has found every form, and institution, and interpretation of his order, and sacramental theory, a means of blessing vital and deeply spiritual for himself. He magnifies the importance of form, he preaches the Church persistently, he proclaims as indispensable his interpretation of the ordinal, and holds up the sacrament to the gaze of the people. All this the priest may do with personal, conscious reverence, and yet be unmindful of the perils which beset his people by reason of his emphasis upon sign and symbol, and visible sacrament, and the ordered succession, and the Holy Church.

The peril lies in the danger that the people will not see through and beyond. Their faith is in peril of being arrested by their senses. It is liable to stop short. It is prone to substitute the

sign for the thing signified. Worship then becomes formal. Materialism dominates spirituality. The organisation, magnified and glorified, then assumes a disproportionate place in the lay consciousness. He swears by the Church, but he swears. He bows low before the altar, but he bows lower in the house of Rimmon, and in the temples of Mammon. He feels the glow of dim religious lights, and a certain sense of æsthetic devotion, and a dim consciousness of a pleasing spiritual warmth. He has touched the garment of Christ. That Christ also by many thousands is touched we know full well. But that there are perils here we know full well also, and they need to be recognised and constantly guarded against.

Then, too, we are liable to put our trust in the power, and in what we regard as the potent perfection, of the organisation. Conscious of our sure and certain incorporation into the Church; conscious of its dignity, its order, its inherent worth, we are prone to delude ourselves with the idea that this in itself is sufficient. Men

sometimes fail, in their sense of conscious security, to realise that they may be in and of the Body of Christ and yet not of His mind and Spirit. Thus they become paralysed members of His Body.

Membership in a Church so largely magnified by its priesthood, so potent in its organisation, so strongly and conspicuously formal and so rich in its symbolic significance, is ever in danger of being assumed and maintained as a substitute, rather than as a vital means of incorporating the soul into union with the life of God, and into close fellowship and conscious communion with Christ Himself. The term Churchman is not always the synonym of the term Christian. The Church may be writ large, and the Christ be but faintly inscribed in the consciousness of man.

These reflections do not constitute in any sense a charge against the Church as a well-ordered organism, with outward and visible signs and means of grace. They simply point to the perils to which the priest and the people,

and especially the people, are exposed in view of the very perfect nature of the organisation. The more perfect the human side of a divine institution becomes, the more liable men are to substitute it for the divine. The glory of the temple obscured from materialistic-minded men the glory of God. The perfection of the manhood of our Master has obscured from many minds the divinity of which His manhood was but the incarnation. The foreground beauty may hide the background life and glory of which it is the manifestation. The frame may be made so golden, and so bejewelled that the eye will rest there and not see the beauty of the face upon the canvas.

It is possible for the Church to become so enamoured of her orders that she may fail to hear the orders of her Lord and Master. It is possible for her to rest so surely in the confidence of her rich possessions, and glorious heritage, that she may fail to hear the voice of her Lord in the cry of the world's need, calling her to Christlike humility of mind, and bid-

ding her come down, as He did, to self-forgetful service, to be misjudged and crucified, that in the end He might be highly exalted, and given a Name above every name, and worshipped and adored as the Son of God who came down from heaven to be the Saviour and Lord of men.

We need to beware lest our position of exclusive aloofness is not born of pride, and the overconsciousness of power. The age is saying far-reaching and deep-searching words about a new conception of divine rights. It is insisting that such claims be interpreted in terms of democracy, or else give way to a new order which shall be responsive to the elemental and imperious needs of the children of God of love, and to the leadership of His Spirit.

CHAPTER XXIX

WHAT WOULD BECOME OF THE PRAYER BOOK?

THE good sense of the Church can be trusted to take care that the Book of Common Prayer shall continue to represent the normal position arrived at by successive generations. This has always been the case in the past. If extreme or radical views prevail at any time and become embodied in the authorised devotions of the Church, their permanent place in the liturgy will depend upon the test of their permanent worth in the experience of a living Church. There is no reason for one generation to become panic-stricken because of innovations or restrictions or alterations in the devotional expressions of the liturgy. The ship has passed

through seas as rough and storms as violent as any which are apt to lie ahead. If there be tempests that are worse, which must yet be met, we may be very sure that, if Christ remains at the helm, we will come to the haven where He would have us be. If He be forced to leave the helm by our insisting upon steering the ship, then the sooner she founders the better.

We should by all means make His task as easy as we can. There are surely none in the Church who would deliberately plan to do otherwise. We should more largely trust each other, and more earnestly endeavour to prove ourselves worthy of trust. By fairness and consideration; by forbearance and self-restraint; by honest candour of speech and humility of mind and heart; by seeking to keep every avenue of approach to God widely open, and thus refusing to lend our voice and influence to close any channel of grace through which divine love flows into human life; by thinking more humbly and loving more comprehensively; we will come into the possession of the spirit

of power and of a sound mind, that will enable us to perceive and know what we ought to do in providing for the expression of the faith and devotion of the people of God.

In this Church the people have a large voice. Their influence for restraint is final and all powerful. The laity have the power of veto over all legislation in this Church, so that nothing can be consummated in the way of change or addition which does not commend itself to their judgment. As a class they deplore religious controversy. It is usually the priests, rather than the people, who agitate for radical changes in doctrinal statements and devotional expression. The average layman is content, if he comes to Church at all, to say the creed which the Church has formulated, and to use the liturgy which the Church has sanctioned, if it is said with a spirit of devotion, and in a voice that can be clearly understood by the people. The tempests of controversy which sweep through Church papers and stir priestly minds to foaming and seething agitation, either do not stir

the laity very deeply, or stir them to the expression of deep regret that, with so many vital and pressing problems to face, the Church should waste so much energy in internecine warfare, and in the bitterness of partisan strife.

The laity is led to wonder if perhaps too much time is not being spent in seminaries in teaching men to split hairs rather than in training them to be strong to level mountains, and prepare the way for the larger and fuller coming of the spirit of the Lord.

CHAPTER XXX

THE DEFENCE AND THE EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE POWER OF ORDERS

IN all that has been said, we have not been unmindful of the necessity of preserving unimpaired the historic heritage of this branch of the Holy Catholic Church. The preservation through centuries of trial of the unbroken continuity of the threefold orders of ministry has had, and must continue to have, a witness-bearing power in the Body of Christ. When we consider that the ministry of the Church was instituted and ordered to be perpetuated prior to the time when the New Testament was written in any of its parts; when we recall that the ministry was appointed to be the custodian, the guardian, and the witness of

the truth; when we consider the credence given by continuity to the genuineness and authenticity of the written revelation, and the practical experience of man in his relationship with God under the terms of the New Covenant promise, we are deeply conscious of the supreme obligation to be faithful to this transmitted trust.

While we have no right to give away what is not ours to dispense with save upon the terms and conditions which will secure the continued and lawful transmission of the trust, we have not only the right but the duty also, to use the trust in the service for righteousness in such a way as will add to its value in the largest possible measure. To hold the trust and add to it ten talents besides, is the kind of stewardship which this Church should seek to exercise.

There is need in the Church for those who will stand by this central stake and defend it, and drive it in deep, and make it permanently secure. There is the same kind of need that this should be done as there is that the centripetal force in the universe should be preserved. In

the light of this illustration, it is instinctively seen that the living Christ is of course the great centripetal force of the Church, but we are speaking now of the organic life of the Church, and here, also, the principle is true.

The defenders of the central stake in the organisation must in all candour recognise that the need for its security lies in the fact that the cords must be pulled far and lengthened. They must not insist that the tent cords be tightly wrapped around the central pole. The fact that they are allowed to be carried far by those who would make the tent covering very wide spread and comprehensive, shows the confidence imposed by them in the pole at the centre to stand the strain. If the men who would fain carry the cords very far afield seem to those at the centre pole to be running riot, or departing too far afield, let it be remembered that they do so because of their supreme trust in the strength of the central stake to stand the strain. If those at the stake will not go forth with those who run with the cords to lengthen

them far, let it be recognised that they remain at their task of defending the stake, that it may not be pulled up and carried away by the cord lengtheners. The centrifugal force is safe and constant only so long as the power which holds things to the centre is preserved and exercised. We need each other. We need the stake. We need the lengthened cord. The world's need calls for a wide-stretched tabernacle. Keep the central stake strong and fast. Trust the cord lengtheners to exercise the faith that they feel in knowing that things at the centre are guarded and kept so secure that they are not afraid of uprooting the stake by largely lengthening the cords. We should not call by ill-sounding names those who feel called of God to keep guard at the centre, and who labour to keep the stake well grounded in the ancient truth. They surely should not call those disloyal who show such supreme faith in the stake at the centre, that they are willing to tie their cords around the hearts of men far removed, and entwine the outstretched cords about the forces of righteous-

ness everywhere, and even venture to cast a life line into the teeth of the tempest, and out upon the darkness of the sea to the ship disabled because they believe that the stake divinely set and guarded by faithful men will hold fast at the centre. What is needed in the Church is the larger confidence which should be felt among men who are brothers and builders together of the tabernacle of God among men.

CHAPTER XXXI

WHAT WE MAY AND WHAT WE CANNOT HOLD

WE may hold our theories. We may tenaciously hold to exclusive interpretations of our orders and sacraments. We may hold to the determination to magnify the outward, the formal, the material side of the Church. We may hold to our insistence upon the supreme importance of a perfected organisation to be maintained and consummated at any cost. We may hold to our exclusive titles, and to our exclusive claims, and to our exclusive position. But we cannot hold the people if we emphasise these things to the exclusion of the spiritual appeal and the spiritual gifts.

The deep heart of humanity feels, and, at times, clearly sees, the nature and quality and

richness of its birthright. The thirst for God is imperious. The longing for the consciousness of communion with Him, and for the possession of His love and His power and His healing, cleansing life is ever present, though, at times, obscured in the soul.

The appealing power of Moody and of Billy Sunday over multitudes of men, and the growing strength of the distinctly spiritual appeal and spiritual emphasis of Christian Science, are both distinct evidences of the power of the peril which inheres in the tendency to materialise and secularise the Church, and bear witness to the peril of substituting in the minds of our people the form, the order, and the organisation in place of the living, vital witness to the personal saving and healing Christ.

If there should be placed a more insistent and definite emphasis upon the spirit of Christ, and less upon the form of the Church; if in place of magnifying the organisation, we should consecrate ourselves to spiritualise more deeply the individual and the Church as a vital organism;

if we should become less exclusive in our consciousness and more responsive to the opportunities for service, more deeply imbued with the spirit of love and fellowship, and more willing to vindicate our orders and organisation by using them in co-operation with other forces of God's constituted Kingdom, is there not every reason found in the revelation of the mind and purpose of Christ to believe that He will be true to His promise that against His Church the gates of hell shall not prevail?

Having for so long pursued the course of an exclusive claim and of an isolated position, it might be well for this Church to try the experiment of following the Master, with those others whom He is leading, into a more vital and spiritual co-operative effort to inspire the minds of men and the ideals of nations, that they be no longer conformed to the standards of the world, but transformed by the renewing of the spirit of the living God.

In doing this the Church would doubtless win and hold a larger following of spiritually

minded men, and the larger fruitage which would be gathered from the harvest fields of the world would more largely commend our orders to the consideration and esteem of those who will increasingly turn to those things which have manifested their worth and power in the practical and vital experience of the Church.

CHAPTER XXXII

ANCIENT LANDMARKS

BY some it will be charged that in what is being contended for we are removing ancient landmarks. There are Biblical injunctions against doing this. This is unquestionably true. These injunctions, however, were pronounced against those who sought, by removing ancient landmarks, to delimit the possessions, and infringe upon the inheritance rights of other tribes in the Covenant Kingdom. We would disclaim any intention of doing this with the landmarks of either truth or Church polity.

The Church may well pause to ask if the landmarks hitherto set by her do mark aright the scope of the spiritual inheritance of the chil-

dren of the Christian covenant promise. Christ found them set to bounds that had been made too narrow, and removed them to mark the bounds of a Church more comprehensive. And in the hole from which He had removed the landmark of tradition, they set up a cross, "and there they crucified Him." It is well, also, to bear in mind that the men who doomed Him to death were led by the High Priest of ecclesiastical "orthodoxy."

PART III

CONFERENCE—CO-OPERATION—UNITY

"Oh, like to the greatness of God is the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the liberal marshes of Glynn."

* * * * *

"Ye marshes, how candid and simple and nothing-withholding and free
Ye publish yourselves to the sky and offer yourselves to the sea!"

* * * * *

"And the sea lends large, as the marsh: lo, out of his plenty the sea
Pours fast:"

* * * * *

"Till his waters have flooded the uttermost creeks and the low-lying lanes,
And the marsh is meshed with a million veins,
The creeks overflow: a thousand rivulets run
'Twixt the roots of the sod; the blades of the marsh-grass stir;"

* * * * *

"And the sea and the marsh are one."

SIDNEY LANIER.

CHAPTER XXXIII

ARE WE PREPARED?

FOR many years the Christian Church prayed for an open door into heathen lands. At last the door was opened. From beyond it came the voices of millions lying in darkness, saying, "Come over and help us." Materialism, parochialism and selfishness gripped and enchained the heart of the Church, and the doors opened by prayer have not been entered yet by a Church passing through them with garments dyed in the blood of her own priestly sacrifice. Through open doors still come the cries of the Father's children in the deep darkness. They are crying for light. From the silence of the sanctuary into which He passed through sacrifice, there comes a voice which asks

why, having so long prayed, stand ye here so long idle before the door which I have opened to you?

For many years the Church has prayed, as her Master prayed, that they all might be one. Intercessions have been offered for an open door to unity. Wider to-day than ever before the door stands open. Are we prepared to enter in? It does not open into a unity perfected and immediate in its organic completeness. It is open, however, to avenues of approach. Ways that lead to fellowship and understanding, and to a sympathetic appreciation of each other's view points, are ways that lead to ultimate unity. There are many who feel convinced that they are the only ways lit by the light of a reasonable hope.

The Church that refuses to give official sanction to those of her communion who feel that they see this open door, and are assured that they hear the Spirit's voice calling them, assumes a grave responsibility. If to invitations and opportunities for official and corporate co-

operation, to be engaged in by those who are willing and desirous of doing so, the Church turns a deaf ear, she will most surely prejudice the great Protestant Communions against the sincerity and spirit of sacrifice which prompts her to suggest discussions and conferences on "faith and order." Why should not the Protestant Communions make reasonable reply that they would not care to consider or accept orders so exclusive and binding as to preclude conference and co-operation with other members of the Body of Christ living in non-conformity, but living still in vital union with Jesus Christ?

The world crisis demands spiritual leadership. We know not what to-morrow has in store. Orders have proven no barrier to bloodshed. Greek and Romanist are fighting each other. Romanists are fighting Romanists, and Protestants are fighting Protestants and fighting with Romanists and fighting against them. There is chaos in the world.

In America, official corruption, and industrial enmity, and greed and materialism are

rampant. Has the Church failed? She has surely failed to put her emphasis on the right things, or in the right proportion. She has failed in vision, and in statesmanship and in power. She has failed to measure up to her high calling in Christ Jesus. She has come to judgment. She has not come to her doom. She can point to many achievements. Because of her ministry there is a keener conscience and a closer brotherhood among men. The world to-day is more easily shocked because standards are higher. In private and public life ideals of a nobler kind are leading men into a richer and more abundant life. In spite of her materialism and blindness, the Christ, through His Church, has still been able to say and do many things.

In the presence of stupendous problems, and face to face with the day of her greatest opportunity, the Church, divided, stands to-day impotent for her task.

Barriers of separation built by incompetent and inadequate thought-processes, created by

ancient prejudices, and erected by mental and finite interpretations of the great uninterpretable, eternal truth of God, divide the Church, and weaken her power to witness, and her capacity to lead men and nations into liberty.

In the presence of our self-created weakness; with the memory of our failures and shortcomings; conscious as we must be of having done many things amiss, and left undone many things which might have helped to heal His broken and divided Body; shall not we who profess and call ourselves Christians turn in these days from endless and formal academic discussions to penitential litanies, and ask God to have mercy upon us and to forgive?

Is it not a time for humility of mind and contriteness of heart? Is it a time for men of a common faith and a common purpose to stand apart? Shall cold stone barriers of logical conviction stem and hinder the flow of the spirit of Christian fellowship and the largest possible measure of Christian conference and co-operation?

What would happen if our Bishops should unite in calling all Christian communions in America who would heed the call into a great representative conference; saying:—"Brethren, come, let us go up into the mount of the Lord and pray and reason together. Our sins have been as scarlet, yet He will have mercy and forgive. The world is calling us. Christ is calling us. Let us not in this great crisis moment stand divided. We are one Body in Christ, and one in essential faith, and one in charity. Let us take counsel together. Let us ask Him, who is our common Lord and Master, what word He would speak through us to this nation and to the nations of the world. Let us, with an apostolic spirit, say, 'Lord, what wilt thou have us do?' and rising from a national council of penitence and prayer, let us follow Him who has promised to be with us to the end of the world, and to lead us into all truth. Come! that through us, His Body, He may speak His message, and work His will in this crisis of the world."

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE CHALLENGE

PROBLEMS face us stupendous in their character and extent. Great questions of education, of social service, of missionary endevour, of healing the breach among the nations, of establishing a just and abiding peace, press for solution. Ignorance, social injustice, nations waiting to be born, and nations waiting to be led into a great world federation, cry aloud to a divided Church for light, and love, and liberty, and guidance. What shall we do about it? A great oncoming wave of democracy is sweeping up and onward in the sea of life. Back of it are great elemental impulses, longings, desires and hopes. Greatest among them is the impulse of liberty, the search for truth, the

undefined, vague, and unsatisfied longing for God.

In this approaching crisis what shall be the attitude of this Church? Shall we stand apart? Are our orders so uncertain that we dare not confer and co-operate, with full official sanction, with those whose orders are different in every respect from our own, for fear that our orders will be compromised, or that we will be misunderstood?

Are we sufficiently sure that His promise to "be with the ministers of apostolic succession" was a promise also not to be with the ministers who are not of the apostolic succession as we define it? Are we sure that He is not with them? If He is, why should we not be? Are we more sacred in our orders, and more exclusive in our fellowship, than is He from whom our orders are derived, and from whom they have their authority? Do we doubt His promise? If He will indeed be with the ministers of apostolic succession to the end of the world, will He not also guard and keep the succession

if the orders sanctioned by it confer, co-operate, and hold Christian fellowship with those with whom He Himself confers, co-operates and holds close fellowship and communion?

CHAPTER XXXV

"THE CHURCH" AND "THIS CHURCH"

OUR Church standards speak very definitely as to what is required of her children, and of those who are authorised to officiate as her ministers. In the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, and in the preface to the Ordinal, she is careful to state that her legislative acts and standard requirements are applicable to what she distinctly and repeatedly calls "*this* Church." There is no question as to the kind of ordination she requires of those who are to "be accounted and taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest and Deacon in this Church." The words "*in this Church,*" express no opinion whatsoever as to who are accounted lawful ministers *by this Church,* in so far as their

ministry is to other communions of the Body of Christ. In the service for the ordering of Priests, the Bishop says, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Priest *in the Church of God.*" Authority is thereby given to the ministers ordained by and in and for *this Church* to preach and administer the sacraments in any branch or communion of "the Church of God" where occasion may offer.

The term "the Church" is of broader significance than the term "this Church." "This Church" is but a part of "the Church" catholic. What then are the other parts? Those who make the distinguishing testing note and standard of measurement the apostolic succession, would answer, the Church of England, of Rome, the Eastern Church, and other communions which hold to, and have come down through, the unbroken succession. Beyond this point questions arise. By some in this Church, other names are applied to Christians in fellowship with each other, who have not the ministry of succession as it is by some defined. It is

claimed that, because this distinctive and essential note is lacking, they are not to be included as being of "the Church."

This Church has, through her House of Bishops, declared to the contrary, and has pronounced it as her conviction that all who have been baptised into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are to be accounted members of the Holy Catholic Church.*

*See General Convention Journal 1886.

CHAPTER XXXVI

CONFERENCE AND CO-OPERATION

"THE individual," says Albert Kocourek, Professor of Jurisprudence in Northwestern University, "is rapidly on the way to the loss of his identity." Society is becoming more and more highly organised. Thought today is everywhere testing itself out in conference. It is seeking to combine with other thought. Action seeks to express itself in co-operation. Most of the world's work is being done in and through boards, committees and commissions, and in various other forms of corporate endeavour. The condition was not created by the Church. It is a sociological development. There is every reason to believe that the tendency is not transient but perma-

nent and progressive. In so far as this Church is possessed of wisdom, and considered to have right judgment, this wisdom and judgment will be sought by others who have, with us, a common purpose and a common ideal in matters pertaining to the social welfare and to the extension of the Kingdom of God. Invitations and opportunities will come with increasing frequency to this Church to enter into conference and co-operative relation with others.

The issue cannot be met by leaving the responsibility to the individual. The Church, unless she desires to become and to be considered archaic, must face the conditions under which life about her everywhere is seeking self-expression. She must determine upon a policy, and come to a decision upon certain questions of principle.

Now it is to be observed that the necessity for doing so does not arise from the demands of restless-minded individuals here and there in the Church, but rather from the conditions un-

der which life about us everywhere is seeking to express itself in terms of efficiency.

To say that we have gone all these years without a fixed policy, and have avoided bringing the question to an issue, is no reason, and offers no avenue of escape for avoiding a responsibility which rises up out of the evolution of the social order, and politely, but insistently, asks us, what we are going to do about it? The Apostles did not have Cathedral cars, but some of their successors have had the wisdom to adapt the Church's ministrations to modern conditions, and to use new material forces, as we are called to use the spiritual forces about us, to extend the kingdom of Christ. There are those in this Church who believe with a deep conviction that this Church is called to fulfill her divinely given mission by using these opportunities, when presented, to help supply the great need for spiritualising and wisely directing this growing sense of corporate responsibility, and this ever-deepening consciousness of civic, national, and international, as well as spiritual

responsibility. This conviction is not born of disloyalty; nor is it the effervescence of a wild or unbalanced enthusiasm. It is a conviction born of a love for the Church, and of a supreme confidence in her ability to hold her own, and justify, in the realm of conference and co-operative relationship, the worth of her balanced tenure of truth, faith and order. It is a conviction spiritually related to a certain and sure sense of responsibility with reference to baptismal, confirmation and ordination vows, and to the vision and consciousness of power which come from bringing the soul in touch with Him in the sacrament of His Body and Blood, and to the consciousness born from listening to the call of Christ in the great Gospel of redemption, read and preached in this Church.

Those who do not feel and see and know the depth of this conviction, and the sense of responsibility, which many priests and laymen in this Church are feeling to-day with reference to this subject, should reverently and seriously consider the consequences which must follow if,

by legislation, this conviction, this consciousness of responsibility, this conscience, which has not grown without earnest prayer, is throttled, and this liberty denied.

It must be admitted and remembered that these priests and laymen came into this Church through baptism and confirmation, and into her ministry through ordination, convinced, as they still are, that this liberty would not be questioned or denied. It should be recognised, also, that they have the same right to ask the assent of the Church to the expression of their views through this Church, as those of contrary opinion have to ask that they be not required to engage in such conference and co-operative relationship as is contrary to their conviction.

It must be remembered that seminaries in this Church, ever held in honourable esteem, have never taught any theory of orders which would preclude such conference and co-operative relationship; and that among the earliest bishops of this Church in America the right and duty

of such co-operation was held and expressed.*

The issue is forced by those who deny the right, not by those who ask to be permitted to continue to exercise it.

The question having been raised, it must of necessity be settled. That it was raised is due to the spirit of the age in which we live. To have avoided it would have been quite impossible. To evade it is also impossible. We should pray for a right judgment, asking for freedom from prejudice, and for the gift of patience, and of courtesy and humility, and do what seems to be our duty to Christ and His Church.

We may make mistakes if we go ahead. We will surely make a mistake if we do not. The age calls us. We must face the call.

First, it would seem that the right of free-conference, without co-operation, and without assessment for expense, should be granted to all organisations and commissions officially constituted in this Church. Their desire to use

* See biographies of Bishop White and Bishop Moore.

every opportunity to seek and know the truth, come whence it may, should be by permission accorded. The Church and the world are both wiser and better from the knowledge of truth revealed out of the conference which Christ held in the wilderness with the Devil, and surely this Church will never be called to confer with any whose position is more unchurchly than was Satan's.

With reference to the question of co-operation, there are more serious difficulties. They should be candidly faced, and thoughtfully and prayerfully considered.

The sanction of the General Church could doubtless be secured without opposition, to the appointment of a commission to confer and co-operate in matters of civic and moral concern and upon questions of national and international peace and politics. To co-operate with men and ministers in these matters would involve no peril to any theory of orders.

Permission could also be given, without controversy, to official boards and commissions to

confer and co-operate with other men and ministers relative to a national or international provision for extending to heathen lands the ministry of healing. Hospitals at home are built, supported and administered by Christian men of all communions without the question of orders being raised. Why the question should be injected into hospital extension in the mission field is not apparent. Presbyterian and Episcopal castor oil and quinine are surely chemically the same.

Permission could be further given for co-operation in erecting, maintaining and administering colleges and universities in the foreign field. At home, Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton, all originally ecclesiastically controlled, have gradually become separate from denominational domination. Why cannot this Church permit co-operation with other men and ministers in this realm of practical endeavour without injecting the question of orders? It is not raised here at home; why, of necessity, should it be forced into the

question of co-operation in the far fields of missionary endeavour, especially when, as we are informed, Christian men and ministers manage to get on better together out there than they do here at home? "The Shantung Christian University in China now stands for union in educational work. The English Baptists provide the plants of the Medical, Normal and Theological Colleges; the Anglicans of Great Britain and the Congregationalists of the United States maintain representatives on the Faculty; and Presbyterians are responsible for the plant and equipment of the Arts College."

The steps leading to the co-operation of the S. P. G. and the Presbyterian Board, together with the correspondence which passed between Bishop Montgomery, Secretary of the S. P. G., are reviewed by Dr. Arthur J. Brown in his recent book, "Unity and Missions."* The chapter entitled "High Church Anglicans and American Presbyterians in Shantung Univer-

* "Unity and Missions," pp. 216-235, Arthur J. Brown. Flemming, H. Revell Co., N. Y.

sity," is well worthy the careful study of all those who are interested in the question of Christian co-operation in educational work, and is of especial interest to those of the Episcopal Church who may be interested in this subject, in view of the fact that the terms of co-operation were finally agreed upon without any semblance of compromise on the part of the English Church. The Presbyterian Board, in accepting the terms and conditions offered by the S. P. G., stated in their resolutions accepting the terms offered by Bishop Montgomery that "union in educational work and ecclesiastical uniformity are not synonymous." After six years of co-operation, the Secretary of the Presbyterian Board writes:

"The result has abundantly justified our faith both in the plan and in the missionaries who were to carry it into effect. The union has been in successful and happy operation ever since. If we cannot get together on all points, we are at least getting together on some; and perhaps others will develop from them.

"Enough has already been accomplished to prove

conclusively that American Presbyterians, English Baptists and High Church Anglicans can harmoniously and effectively co-operate in educational work without any sacrifice of principle, where the men concerned have the mind of Christ. Each of these communions is carrying into the University 'its full dogmatic system,' and the result is not discord but large and catholic concord."

"The experience should be helpful elsewhere. The co-operation which we all desire will never spring full-orbed into being. A beginning must be made, small perhaps and very imperfect; but when an opportunity opens to make that beginning, let us meet it with deep solemnity and a willingness to make any adjustment which does not involve conscious disloyalty to our Lord Jesus Christ. He who prayed with unutterable yearning that His disciples might 'be one' will surely help them in any effort to walk together in loving service in His Holy Name." *

Those in this Church, who advocate and urge co-operation with other communions not of our Church order, see no valid ground or reason why such co-operation should in any way in-

* "Unity and Missions," p. 235.

volve the sacrifice of any principle relative to the faith and order of the Church. They feel with a deep sense of conviction that such co-operation would afford opportunity for vindicating the value of the heritage of the Church, and give practical manifestation of its inherent worth.

There is current in this Church the contention that to give formal and official consent to such conference and co-operative relationship would be to sacrifice an essential and fundamental principle. To withhold such consent results in the sacrifice of principles which many regard as being far more vital and fundamental. If the Church must make a sacrifice, she should be careful that she sacrifices the right thing. If she is compelled to set up a cross, and is called to suffer upon it, as she is compelled and called to do, she should take up her cross and follow Him who offered His Body upon Calvary that He might give His life to redeem the world. The Body thus offered in sacrifice finds itself glorified in the great realms

of spirit life. We must not shackle or crucify the spirit of Christ.

The Church must remember that sins of omission are as grave and serious as the sins of commission. It was the sin of omission which the Master condemned in the priest and Levite who, fearful of committing an offence against orthodoxy, and the integrity of the Jewish Church, passed by on the other side. It was the clanking of the delimiting chains of ecclesiasticism which, also, led Him to ask the orthodox Church, standing shackled by tradition by the untilled vineyard, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?"

It would be perfectly possible and entirely practicable for this Church to disclaim, in a preamble, the intention of giving any interpretation as to her theory of the priestly orders of the Church, and then, without any compromise or sacrifice of conviction, resolve to permit and allow official conference and co-operation within prescribed and definite limits, restricting, by express declaration, such co-opera-

tion as would involve the delimitation of her field of endeavour and responsibility.

This would combine the principle of liberty with the principle of conservation, and would be fair and considerate to all views and convictions held and cherished in this Church.

Others, whose opinions are worthy of consideration, would understand that no compromise of conviction was involved or implied in such Christian conference and co-operation as we have ventured to suggest.

CHAPTER XXXVII

MOVEMENTS TOWARD UNITY

IT often happens that, while man is engaged in planning his own way for the entrance of God into human life, and standing expectant at the door through which he has decreed that Christ must enter, that suddenly, through unobserved methods of approach, the Lord appears in His temple, and comes and stands in the midst of His people. His Spirit worketh where He listeth. In and through forces which man may despise and reject, He works to fulfill the divine purpose. In and along ways which human hands have not built, comes the Spirit of the eternal purpose. We decree that God must, almost of necessity, come according to the way of our planning, and lo! He comes

through means and forces which we have accounted futile and foolish. We build majestic highways for His approach, and lo! "He comes in clouds descending." Because He came not as His ancient Church had expected and decreed, they knew Him not when He came. Because He used not their plan for revealing His messiahship, they despised and rejected Him. He stood in the midst of them, and they knew Him not.

The Church of to-day would do well to remember that it was pride of order and system, and the slavery to interpretation, that blinded the minds and hearts of a Church more ancient than our own, so that it did not see Him who came to fulfill their law and their prophets.

With conscious humility of mind and with reverent purpose we may study the spiritual forces which are working in human life to-day and ask what their signs of promise are.

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF A NOBLE DISCONTENT

There is an increasing evidence of a feeling of noble discontent with conditions which now exist. The economic waste which arises out of our unhappy divisions is making itself more widely and deeply felt. Men are asking if it is worth while to maintain and support rival organisations which compete for support in small communities, when the ancient reasons for their separate existence have been almost forgotten, and when now they stand for practically the same things. Men are to-day counting the spires which rise from hamlets all over the country-side; they are counting the number of people who, on Sunday, pass through the rival church doors. They are taking account of the starvation wages that are paid to five parsons in towns of 1500 or 2000 people all over the land. They are asking, why should we continue to do it? They are listening with one ear to the appeal for the support of these five hamlet parsons, and their five half-empty churches,

and with the other, they are listening to the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us." They notice that it comes from lands where there are millions who are without the means of healing, and of education, and of the knowledge of Him who came to be the light of the world. They are listening with an ever-increasing consciousness of the burden and the privilege of responding to the numerous appeals which come out of the awakened social conscience, for war relief, for the support of education, united charity, settlement work, for the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., for emancipating the negro, and the child labourer, and the slaves to intemperance, and the slaves to ignorance, and the slaves to social vice, and the slaves to many other forms of human bondage. Many men of benevolent disposition are to-day giving twenty-five and fifty per cent of their incomes in response to these and other vital appeals. They have the right to ask the comparative worth of the appeal which comes to build or support another rival church, which

stands for nothing vitally distinctive as compared with the appeal from China, or the neighbourhood settlement house, or the great reconstructive work of social service and liberal, and at the same time religious, education.

There are sure signs that the appeals of this kind are going to become more imperative and call for even more generous liberality. The oncoming demand for week-day instruction in religion, the plans which are now being thought out for giving graded instruction in the elements of religion in connection with the system of public-school instruction, are destined to make stupendous demands upon the liberality of those who believe that this must be done to stem the growing tide of unbelief and the selfishness, vice, and materialism which result from it.

That men are discontented with social and religious conditions as they now exist is increasingly evident. Those responsible in the various Christian communities for planning their church policies for the future are in the

presence of grave responsibilities. It is a crisis when much time needs to be spent in seeking through prayer to know what is God's will and purpose. If He calls us to Calvary, we must be willing, with a supreme faith, to go there and crucify our pride, and prejudice, "and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord." We need, also, to beware what we label in these days as "ungodly union." We need to ask, may it not be ungodly separation and disunion?

THE FINDING OF THE AMERICAN LAYMAN

The most significant discovery in the recent development of the Church has been the finding of the layman. He has found himself, and he has been discovered by the Church. In this discovery lies the hope and promise of a great spiritual democracy. The age of priestcraft has forever gone. The layman has come, and he has come to stay. With a new-born consciousness of personal responsibility, with a new-born

vision of his duty with reference to the mission of the Church, with a new-born realization of his own inherent priestly, prophetic, and kingly qualities as a son of God, and as a joint heir with Christ of the gifts of God, he stands to-day asking as never before, "Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" He thinks he is hearing the answer of his Lord in the cry of the world's need. He is convinced that the call to service and to co-operation is the call of the Father. He is offering himself for this service. He is saying, "Here am I. Send me."

In connection with the student association work, and the missionary volunteer work, and the Laymen's Missionary Movement, and the federation of Churches, and social settlement work, and co-operative endeavour for religious education, and on charity organisation boards, and Y. M. C. A. directorates, and in countless other forms of united Christian service, the laymen of our various and divided communions are coming to know and to respect each other. They are finding in one common faith, in one com-

mon Lord and Master, a practical basis and inspiration for corporate service. They are asking why they cannot engage in corporate communion in search for closer bonds of unity with Christ and with each other.

There are other and far more significant movements looking to practical Christian cooperation which are welling up in the minds of thinking laymen, and they are talking to their ministers.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

OUR POSITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

IS it the opinion of the Church of Rome, or the great Eastern Church which restrains us? Surely their opinion is worthy of respect. As far as the Eastern Church is concerned, is it not fair to ask if we might not teach that Church some very valuable lessons by acting ourselves in the light of a broader vision, and by placing our orders in more vital touch with the ignorance and social injustice and the great, human needs of the world in a way that would bring larger light and liberty and power to men? Would not the Eastern Church ultimately respect us more if we used our orders and our influence in a way to make them more largely

felt and more widely recognised and respected? Would not the fearless and forceful leadership which our Bishops might take in great conferences called to consider world problems tend to make the Bishops of the Eastern Church realise more fully the need for closer union with us in view of the great reconstructive work which the Church is called to do in helping the nations find their interdependence, and in leading them to fulfill their destiny? Would not the manifestation of the power of "order," in the midst of disorder, which might be shown in great, officially sanctioned efforts of co-operation, tend to win the larger measure of respect, and help to create a compelling sense of need for closer fellowship between our leaders and the leaders of the Orthodox Eastern Church, if, instead of holding on to restraining fears and convictions as to the succession, they would actually succeed in leading with their power of order the disordered forces of righteousness and the disunited but spiritually impowered communions in the army of Christ?

There can be no question but that the Orthodox Eastern Church is to-day enchained by formalism and despotism, and is in need of a great emancipation. Tied as she is to the state, she shares, if she does not contribute to create, the ignorance, the superstition, and the bigotry which so largely characterise the great nation where her dominance is supreme. Raising no potent voice against the persecution of the Jews; largely complacent in the presence of superstitions which she fosters and encourages, and allowing so many of her children all over the empire to remain in illiteracy, without vigorous protests to the government of which she is a part, she stands to-day in need of a great awakening, in the presence of an oncoming national crisis, and in the midst of a mighty people of latent genius, and of vast slumbering but now fast awakening potentialities. She would be stirred by the spectacle of great coherent and co-ordinated spiritual forces voicing to the public conscience, and through this conscience to the government, the great appeal for truth, and

justice, and mercy, and national righteousness, and human brotherhood.

Is the appeal of the cloister, of the study, of antiquity, as strong to-day for guarding a trust, as is the appeal which comes from the cry and the blood of the world to use that trust? Shall we battle for it, or battle with it? Shall we lose our life in seeking to save it, or save it in giving it even unto what men call death, in losing it in service? Can we not, in this crisis, trust the heart and mind of the Eastern Church to understand?

CHAPTER XXXIX

OUR POSITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

ARE we being too largely restrained by our desire to win the confidence and respect of the Church of Rome? We are in full accord with those who desire this ultimate union. We believe, however, that there is good reason to question the wisdom of that method which asks that we withhold from conference, co-operation and fellowship with Protestant Communions for fear that we will be misunderstood by Rome. Will we not appear, it is asked, to place our orders on a parity with Protestant orders, and disorder generally, and thus seem to forfeit our own claim to a ministry preserved in unbroken historical continuity, and guarded and

validated by an unbroken succession? Perhaps so. But there are other considerations which are worthy of serious thought, which, if they be as potent as we believe them to be, would suggest an entirely different method of procedure, with the view of attaining the same end which is aimed at by adopting the present method and policy of exclusiveness.

The open and candid mind will ever recognise the many and great spiritual virtues displayed throughout the centuries in the character of many devout and earnest members of the great Roman Communion. Her saints and heroes are a part of the heritage of our common Christianity, and are an inspiration to the cultivation of virtue and courage, and true saintliness of spirit. The organisation and administration of the Church of Rome has ever been characterised by a certain governmental genius, which, while it has not always been prosecuted with true and far-reaching statesmanship, has manifested, as no other organisation on earth has done, the masterful ability to control and dis-

cipline great and diverse masses of people under a monarchical system.

While it is clearly recognised that many individual Romanists do not hold the views, and maintain the attitude of open defiance and antagonism to Protestant Christianity, to which we shall refer, yet it is evident from history, and is of current knowledge, that, as an organisation speaking with official authority, and maintaining an official attitude, her position is one of radical antagonism and exclusiveness. In this discussion it is the official attitude of the Roman Church which we have in mind, and which is under consideration.

The Church of Rome has ever been most deeply impressed, and as her history shows, has ever been most largely influenced by the consciousness, the dream, the hope, and the spectacle of power. She feels that she can, with calm complacency and satisfaction, view the spectacle of disordered and disjointed Protestantism. She glories in it. She points to it with self-conscious pride. She ridicules it. She

classes this Church as a part of it. In matters where her interests are concerned, she speaks with one voice the demands of millions. Having spoken, she pauses to listen. She hears many contending voices of protest. They lack unity; they lack force; they lack convincing, sentiment-making, vote-making influence. She calmly surveys this Babel confusion of protest. She is self-satisfied. She speaks with louder tone, and, where she can do so, she speaks in more compelling accents. Where her authority is or has been supreme, she speaks, or spake, with imperious demand. It is to her interest that the voice of protest should be a divided voice. It is to her interest that this disunion should be maintained and increased, or absorbed by her organisation. She doubtless listens with supreme satisfaction to the terms which we apply in moments of controversial heat of mind and coldness of heart to our non-conformist brethren. She is doubtless well pleased, also, that we call each other by names which portray party spirit and inherent disunity in our letters

to "Mr. Editor." It is to the interest of worldly wise Rome that worldly unwise Protestantism should be kept as sectarian as possible. Some of her writers record the birth of a new sect with almost as much satisfaction as is felt in canonising a saint. The divisions of the forces of Protestantism strengthen the power of the Pope.

A recent communication from the Vatican declares in terms which can but be commended for their perfect clearness of statement, Rome's uncompromising position as to her basis of unity. "Unity resides in me," writes his holiness, the Pope, to the members of the Conference on Faith and Order. Unquestionably a great power of unity does reside in him. So great is this unity, as it stands in contrast with the disunity of Christendom outside of him, that he, at present, feels that, while he may lament its existence outside of his organisation, he can afford to disregard it as a working force with which he must reckon. Disunion in Protestantism is so great that he neither fears nor respects it.

Shall we seek our union with him upon his terms, or would it be better for us to seek, by making ourselves felt in the united influence of ourselves with other communions outside his control, to make it expedient for him to change his terms from those of unconditional submission to his authority, to some form of union without such unconditional submission?

Rome has ever held to the doctrine of temporal power. To-day she holds this doctrine in abeyance. She holds it, however, in reserve for future use, and she holds the system and theory of her exclusive, divine right inviolate, in order that she may have the means of power when occasion offers for its exercise. As long as this seems, in the light of her past history, the most promising method for exercising her temporal power, she will, without compromise, and without yielding, remain unbending to any approach from others which does not recognise these claims and submit to them. This is made evident as being her present attitude in the letter recently received from the Vatican ad-

dressed to the Conference on Faith and Order.

There are, however, other and more vital ways of exercising spiritual powers over temporal affairs. Through united prayer, and by religious education wisely planned and directed; by changing current customs and existing political and industrial standards; by enlightening the public conscience, and emancipating the will from the controlling desires and impulses which arise out of greed, covetousness and inordinate selfishness; by proclaiming the truth that makes men free; and by the exercise of a spiritual influence that shall bring men and nations to see the vision, and to seek communion with Him in Whom is the abundance of life, and who is Himself the source and power of all human liberty; the Church may exert, through corporate spiritual endeavour, an influence over the powers which rule in high places and low that would be transforming, and far more permanent and vital than could ever come from dominating the will by the voice of an external authority. The authority of Christ is supreme,

but it is distinctive from every other form of authority in that it is inherent in His Body through His Spirit, and speaks from within to the conscience of man, and through the whole Body, as well as through a constituted ministry, to the conscience of rulers and to the life of nations.

When Christ shall have become supremely regnant in the consciousness of His Body and in the conscience of the race, the will of God will be done upon earth as it is in heaven. This end cannot be attained, and it is doubtful if it can be largely furthered, by the voice of external authority decreeing dogmas, and imposing laws with the claim of an infallible divine right; or, on the other hand, by the passage of sumptuary laws which endeavour to reconstruct society by an authority imposed from without. Neither the external voice of an exalted dignitary in the Church, nor the voice of external law, neither the Pope, nor Protestantism, militant and aggressive in and through legislative enactments, can bring into human consciousness,

and place over the conscience of men or of nations, the reign of the Kingdom of God. Such voices and influences may help change the outward environment of life, but life itself must be built up by response to the inner voice of God, and the submission of the will to the direction and control of the Spirit of Christ incarnate and remnant in his Body, the Church.

If the Conference on Faith and Order should feel convinced that its largest hope lies in maintaining a distinctly, and somewhat exclusive conciliatory attitude toward the Orthodox Eastern Church, and the Church of Rome, it might then be well, during the centuries which seem destined to intervene while the Conference is proceeding on this basis, and with this most desirable end in view, to organise a Conference and Co-operation of Faith and Disorder, in order to help solve the grave and pressing problems which face us now, and which cannot, without disaster, abide long academic considerations of questions of order and administration.

With full and cordial recognition of the need

for ultimate organic unity, under a generally accepted order, which will unify the expressions of faith, and preserve and bear witness to the truth committed to the Church, it may still be maintained and urged that conference and co-operation among those who hold the fundamental and vital elements of faith essential to salvation, could be undertaken with a view of bringing to bear upon the stupendous problems which face us in this world crisis the practical unity of the forces and convictions which inhere in the various communions of Protestant Christianity, to the end that, with one mind and one heart, we might make the mind and will of Christ regnant in the thought of the nations and in the councils of the world.

There are many in the Church who feel profoundly convinced that such corporate union of spiritual forces, now weakened through disunion, would be capable of facing the social, industrial and international problems which arise out of past neglect, and out of the present world crisis, with a power and influence which cannot

be exerted by any one communion, or by them all speaking independently of each other. The ideals of Jesus Christ are capable of realisation in and through the united Church alone. While the ultimate aim should be organic unity, the present necessity calls for every possible measure of unity of spirit that can be expressed through practical co-operation as a result of fraternal conference and federated purpose. Can we not, therefore, co-ordinate and unify the will to serve?

The result of such well-considered and wisely directed corporate Christian influence would be sure to make an impression upon the consciousness of the Church of Rome. Rome has ever sought to have her name regarded as the synonym of power. There was a time when this desire was fulfilled in larger measure than it is to-day. She still fondly cherishes her ancient ambitions. Her position to-day is one of waiting watchfulness. She waits the return to her dominion of those who, in their desire for unity, will submit to her claims and domination. The

practical question to be considered is: as to what influences and conditions will lead Rome to reconsider her position and recast her claims, and so alter her terms of unity as to make them at least possible for intelligent and hopeful consideration.

The Church of Rome is seen at its best in those countries where she is in competition with, and restrained by the presence and influence of Protestant Christianity. The strengthening of Protestant influence by co-operative endeavour would undoubtedly tend to help the Roman Church to break the bonds by which her life is enchained, and make her a more vital and tolerant, as well as a more distinctly spiritual force than she is to-day. It would perhaps lead her to compare more closely the decrees of the Council of Trent with the decrees of the first Apostolic Council of Jerusalem.

When Rome shall come to hear a voice as loud and as far-reaching as her own; when she sees that the forces of non-conformity to her rule and order, which now, by reason of their

disunion and incoherence, she regards with indifference, have come to a practical unity of agreement and are co-operating in their influence upon temporal powers with an influence as great as, or greater than her own, Rome will then begin to respect and desire the forces which, in their disunion, fail to hinder her supreme influence. The respect which Rome has ever had for power; the agelong consciousness of a dream, largely at one time, but never completely fulfilled, but still fondly cherished, would lead her to ask herself some very searching questions if she saw in America the actual coming together into practical and potent conference and federation of the forces of non-conformity. The Protestant Episcopal Church is, from her viewpoint, included among these forces. She is regarded as being, with the rest of the Anglican Communion, largely responsible for Christian schism and dissent. To be regarded by Rome as schismatic, and by non-conformity as exclusive and self-centred, would seem to preclude the possibility of our assuming

corporate leadership anywhere until we can manage to get into a working agreement with some part of the unhappily divided Christian world. Protestants, at least, will work with us if we will let them. At times, with a humility which certainly is not born of any recognition of our numerical strength, they have shown a disposition to welcome us to leadership. The capacity of the Episcopal Church for organisation and for coherent endeavour has made its impress upon other communions, and the impression would unquestionably be deepened, and the disposition to consider episcopacy as essential to the most efficient administration would be increased if we should, with our ordered system, enter into fellowship and co-operation with them in the effort to help solve the problems which arise out of economic, political, ecclesiastical and international disorder.

Rome would then take more thoughtful notice of us. She has ever been quick to measure forces. She knows when to be defiant, and when to be conciliatory. Under present conditions,

Rome knows that she is more dominant than any one other ecclesiastical power.

The plea and appeal here made for a federation, a co-operation, among the forces in Christianity to which Rome is antagonistic, is in no sense made out of any feeling of enmity to Rome. It is not with the idea of oppressing her but of impressing her that we feel the value of the suggestion that, for a practical constructive programme, we should get into closer relationship with the non-conforming Christian Communions.

We can well understand that it would be to the interest of the Church of Rome that the Episcopal Church in America, and the Anglican Church all over the world, should be kept as a buffer between her and radical Protestantism.

Having so long failed to lead Rome to make any concession to our position, or to recognise in any way either our orders or our sacraments, might it not be well, at least, to get on speaking terms, and, if possible, into closer fellowship, and, as far as is practicable, into co-operative

agreement with those communions in the Church of God who do not dispute the perfect regularity of our orders, who recognise the validity of our sacraments, and who are, even now, fully united with us in the confession of a common faith as it is expressed in the Apostles' creed?

CHAPTER XL

CONFERENCE AND CO-OPERATION WITH PROTESTANT COMMUNIONS

THE plan and hope for organic Church unity must include Eastern, Roman and Protestant Christianity, and all other communions in the Church of God. At present, and doubtless for a long time to come, the organic unity of this church with all the Protestant Communions existing to-day in non-conformity to her order and worship, is neither possible, nor is it immediately desirable. This Church would be completely swamped, and her distinctive ideals would be almost, if not entirely, effaced in the event that the most radical non-conformists, for example, should accept the quadrilateral proposal, and come into organic unity with this

Church. Their view-point, their methods, their attitude, would by overwhelming majorities control in the councils of this Church. Their Bishops, in council, would far outnumber our own. That radical and progressive views are needed and perform a valuable function in Christian enterprise, is unquestionably true; but that these views should be made overwhelmingly dominant in the councils and legislation of a united Church is a question of more doubtful expediency. Some branches of non-conformity would tend to contribute a balancing element of conservatism. At present, however, it would seem that, with views, methods, and policies so radically divergent, it would be better that denominational independence and responsibility should, during a process of education and development, continue to exist. Gradually, those whose views and methods accord, will doubtless affiliate and unite, which will lessen the problem of ultimate unity by delimiting the scope of radical differences.

In the meanwhile, conference and co-opera-

tion upon matters of common concern, and within limits agreed upon, would tend to create mutual understanding, and mutual sympathy. It would also give practical coherence and solidarity to the forces of righteousness having their roots in a common spiritual faith. And it would enable the separate communions to maintain their conservative or radical viewpoints without the compromise of organic dignity, principle, or conviction, which each would continue to reserve the right to maintain and assert.

At the present time, by reason of its exclusive position, the Episcopal Church neither knows nor understands those to whom she has made her quadrilateral offer. If they should accept it, she would be suddenly brought into organic relationship with great communions without having previously created any basis of mutual understanding and sympathy.

If assent were given for conference and cooperation, it would afford the opportunity for creating an atmosphere of sympathy and form-

ing a basis of understanding. It would also make it possible for the Christian conscience to voice itself, and for spiritual conviction to express itself in matters of public concern, and upon questions of national and international moral and spiritual reconstruction, without the sacrifice of any distinctive principles whatsoever.

But, it is asked, shall we sacrifice our orders? In what way should we sacrifice them? If offered upon the altar of world service, they would be glorified. If thrown into the midst of disorder and chaos with the hope of reconstructing the shattered ideals and institutions which are tumbling down all over the world, the sacrifice would not be a loss but a gain. If, by sacrificing our orders, is meant abandoning them, then it may be answered that no immediate or impending crisis suggests any reason why this should be for a moment considered.

We are convinced, both from observation and experience, that our orders and our ordered Church are never more largely appreciated than

when this Church and her ministry enter into cordial and sympathetic conference and co-operative relationship with other Christian communions. It often happens that the best way to fight for the triumph of our convictions is to fight fearlessly and triumphantly with them. The supreme excellence of a well-tempered ancient blade may be shown by taking it into the thick of a hard-fought fight; or it may be described and held up as worthy of high regard in the description given of it in the catalogue of an ancient armoury. When the great fight for liberty and truth is on in the world, men would rather choose to test the value of the ancient sword by putting it into action. Rome has two swords. Protestantism has one. But this one is badly broken. Shall we fight each other with the fragments, or weld them together, and, united in hope and purpose and high resolve, follow our acknowledged Leader into the thick of the fight where "He goes forth to war"? How the army shall ultimately be officered may best be determined when it is fully

mobilised. The chances are that the common sense which will be born out of experience will show the need for a generally accepted order. This will be the opportunity of this Church to make her contribution. The need for what she has to contribute to create and preserve corporate unity will then be seen and felt. In times of war, the nation instinctively looks to West Point. It is for us to show our capacity for leadership. This capacity is shown most convincingly in a self-forgetful willingness to serve anywhere, and to serve with any who, with us, are willing to follow in His train Who came not to be ministered into but to minister, and Who was among us as one Who was the greatest Master because He was the humblest and most self-sacrificing servant.

CHAPTER XLI

THE RECOGNITION OF THE LAYMAN BY THIS CHURCH

IN the baptismal office, the Episcopal Church signs and seals those who come to this holy sacrament with the tokens of their inheritance as the children of God, and the heirs of the Kingdom of Christ, into whose Body they are then, as living members, incorporated. The Church declares that, in view of this vital and spiritual union with the great Head of the Church, each member of His Body is expected to continually receive and express the life and power of the risen Christ. It becomes the duty and privilege of each member of His Body to aid in extending the Kingdom of God. This is the mission of the Church. The baptismal

service is thus the foundation charter of the great spiritual democracy which the Church is called of God to establish in the earth.

From this basis proceeds the conception of the Church with regard to the duties and birthright obligation and privileges of the laity in the government and work of the Church. Bishop Vail, in his chapter on the government of the Church, has very clearly stated this fundamental fact with reference to position of the laity. "The government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," he writes, "is strictly and purely democratical; that is to say, every member of the Church, without any exception in any class, has an equal right in the making of every one of its laws, and in appointing the method and means of their administration. Or, to express the same idea in another form, there is not a single exercise of authority in this Church which may not be directly influenced by every member of it. The supreme power of governing this Church is the will of the majority of the whole Church, which is com-

posed of Bishops, Clergy and laity; so that Bishops cannot govern alone, nor the Clergy alone, nor the laity alone. But all these three, as equally belonging to the Church, and interested in it, act together, and thus, in the highest and justest style of popular and universal suffrage, the certainly ascertained will of the actual majority of the whole Church is the supreme law of the Church.

"The government of this Church is also representative; that is to say, its laws are all made by bodies composed of representatives elected by the whole Church."

The place and power of the laity in this Church is scarcely realised by the laity themselves. They, perhaps, do not pause to consider the far-reaching extent of their inherent responsibilities. It is to be feared that, while many of the priests of the Church seem at times to take themselves too seriously, the laymen of the Church do not take themselves seriously enough. The nature and scope of lay obligation and influence are evident when the follow-

ing constitutional provisions of this Church are seen and realised.

The congregation elects the parish vestry. The vestry calls the rector, and administers the temporal affairs of the parish. It, however, does much more than this. The vestry determines and certifies as to the fitness of every candidate for Holy Orders seeking to go from the parish into the priesthood. No man can enter the ministry of this Church until his fitness has been duly considered by the vestry assembled, and until a majority of their whole number shall have signed their assent and testimonial to the fact that they consider him morally, mentally and otherwise fitted to enter upon preparation for the sacred office.

Then, too, the vestry elects delegates to the council which is the governing legislative body of the diocese. No measure can be passed in the council which is disapproved by the laity. A vote by orders may at any point be demanded. All executive officers, including the Bishop and the Standing Committee, are elected by a con-

current vote of the clergy and laity, and the consent of a majority of both orders is required to secure an election.

The Diocesan Council thus constituted elects the Standing Committee, which is composed of an equal number of clergymen and laymen. The Standing Committee thus constituted is called to give final consent to the ordination of candidates for Holy Orders, so that twice the applicant for ordination has to pass the scrutiny of the laity, and secure their assent. The Standing Committee also has to give, or refuse, consent to the consecration of Bishops, so that no man can be elevated to this office unless approved either by the vote of the General Convention assembled, or by the majority vote of all the Standing Committees of the Church.

The Diocesan Convention, through a vote by orders, elects four clerical and four lay deputies to the triennial General Convention of the Church. In that body three separate, and yet concurrent votes, may be demanded, and a ma-

jority in each order required to secure the adoption of any propositions, or the passage of any vital measure. The House of Bishops sits apart and votes in its own order. The House of Deputies, composed of four clerical and four lay delegates from each diocese and missionary jurisdiction, sits as one body. But upon demand, any vote upon a vital proposition may be required to be taken by orders, giving power to the laity to prevent the passage of any measure which, by them, is disapproved, even though it has received the assent of a majority vote in the House of Bishops, and the assent of a majority vote of the clerical order in the House of Deputies. Any constitutional change or Prayer Book alteration has to be voted on by orders, and then referred back for consideration to the Diocesan Councils, and thus comes back directly to the congregations, who, through their vestries, elect the delegates to the Council. Thus the laity are impowered with fundamental and grave responsibilities in this Church, which, by reason of these constitutional provisions, is

essentially democratic in the form and spirit of her government and administration.

It is, however, significant that the call which has aroused the laity of this Church to the large measure of their sense of responsibility for helping to fulfill the mission of the Church, as recently manifested, is a call which has come to them, in large measure, from outside this Church.

The clear, definite call to world evangelization; the practical and potent appeal of the Laymen's Missionary Organisation, voiced through conventions held all over America, and expressed through the every member canvass idea, which originated in this organisation, has aroused and enlisted the co-operation of the laity of this Church to an extent which we should gladly recognise and accord to the spirit and desire of these co-operative endeavours to extend the Kingdom of Christ. The Church trained the spirit in the laity which makes the response, and by her spiritual ministration, trained the will to respond. The call, however,

which is to-day inspiring thousands of laymen in this Church to make response is the call of Christ through agencies originating outside her fold.

That there are agencies, such as the Sunday School Movement, the Y. M. C. A. and the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, which were born in the consecrated thought of her own sons, and which have been heard and answered by men of every Christian communion, shows how interrelated and interdependent we are in the great Household of God, "which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

The time has surely come when it behooves the bishops and pastors of the Church to face the facts as they exist, with an open and candid mind, and to take inventory of the forces and inspirational impulses which are to-day appealing to the laymen of this Church, and which will appeal with more impelling power in the years which lie immediately ahead, and to ask what is the wisest policy to pursue in order to conserve and keep in touch with these forces which

are now so potently at work in the heart and conscience and will of so many of her members.

In determining what this policy shall be, the laity have, in this Church, a voice and influence which, if it should make itself felt in legislation, as it does in co-operative endeavour, would tend very largely to decide what should be the policy and attitude of this Church with reference to these great world movements, and spiritual awakenings which are going on about us, and which will go on without us, but which are calling to us to help, with a pathos and power of appeal which sounds to very many of us as though it were the voice of the Son of God and Saviour of mankind speaking to us through the baptised membership of His Body.

CHAPTER XLII

THE WAY PREPARED FOR THIS CHURCH

THIS Church stands to-day before a wide-open door of opportunity. She has much to give. Her inheritance from the past is a possession needed to enrich and impower the Church of the future. The creed she says is being increasingly said by other communions. The prayers of her liturgy are being more frequently learned and woven into the public prayers of non-conformist ministers. Recently her prayer for missions has been printed and used in unison by the thousand and more men and women convened in two great Laymen's Missionary Conventions. The Christian Year is winning constantly increasing favour. The

great festivals which we keep are being widely observed in other communions. Advent and Lenten services are publicly announced, and appropriate penitential devotions are made in many Churches not of our communion. Vested choirs and vested ministers are no longer distinctly characteristic of any one body in the Church of Christ. Ancient prejudices against our form and ceremonial worship are passing away. The prejudice against prelacy is deep rooted, and is perhaps more vital than ever in view of the growing consciousness of democracy, and in view of the conviction, which the world crisis has accentuated, that the claim of a divine right to rule must seek and vindicate its exclusive claim on some other ground than hereditary descent. The value of continuity of order, and the conserving and pragmatic value of the executive and administrative episcopal form of government, are, by many, coming to be frankly acknowledged, and sincerely desired.

What is now needed is the creation of an

atmosphere of sympathetic understanding. The scribes and Pharisees who, in this hour so pregnant with the hope and desire for unity, use the language of bitterness, and of animosity, and cast terms of caustic speech into the faces of other members of the Body of Christ to burn them like vitriol, are the enemies of the spirit and the hope of unity in this day of the open door of opportunity. Such language proceeds from the prejudice-blinded mind of the ecclesiastic and not from the hearts of men inspired by the Spirit of Christ.

On the other hand, every approach which tends to conciliate the spirit of misunderstanding, and to break down the barriers of prejudice, should be, by this Church, welcomed and encouraged. If she comes bearing in one hand her ancient treasures, and in the other a drawn sword, her approach will scarcely meet with a glad response and a cordial welcome. If she comes with princely pomp and arrogant spirit and stands armed for defence at the open door, it is apt to be closed in her face. If she comes

as one girt about the waist with a towel, anxious and ready to serve, she will be welcomed at the open door by other servants of the Son of God, Who humbled Himself and made Himself of no reputation that through humility and love He might conquer and win the hearts of men.

CHAPTER XLIII

THE WORLD, THE WORK, THE WASTE, CO-WORKERS

THE laymen are beginning to think of the mission of the Church in terms commensurate with its dignity. They are coming to realise that the mission is too great for any one communion, and that useless waste results from a lack of unity of plan and purpose. Why, it is asked, does not the great Christian Church get together and plan a programme? The time is near at hand when this will be done. The Episcopal Church must decide as to what shall be her official relation to the world programme. Many of her wealthiest and most influential laymen will have no hesitancy in deciding what their attitude will be. That many of them will

co-operate with munificent gifts, commensurate with the magnitude of the endeavour, may be reasonably expected and confidently assumed.

If representatives of missionary organisations at home and abroad should come into conference and take up first a plan and programme for providing hospitals for the mission fields of the world, the task would challenge the faith of the world. A survey could be made by experts to ascertain just where great Christian hospital centres could be located in China, Japan, India and other non-Christian countries. A programme could be planned extending over from three to five years. It could be based upon the expectation of securing for this purpose perhaps two or more million dollars a year. The sum needed might demand five million a year. With the Christian world committed to the plan, the sum would not be impossible. This appeal, addressed to men of large means, would come to them in terms in which they have been accustomed to think. It would impress them as an economic and businesslike proposition, and

would make a splendid demand upon their sympathy and their faith. It would assure them that what they were giving to help heal the nations would not be spent in rival and reduplicated institutions. With ten million dollars there could be built one hundred hospitals, or fifty with endowment sufficient to provide for them. Men of all communions would rally to the support of such a programme as they have rallied to the appeals of the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A.

The same kind of programme might be, and doubtless will be (it surely should be), worked out with a view to provide a certain number of national Christian colleges and universities for non-Christian countries. Again, as a result of an international survey, and a concerted endeavour, a programme extending over from three to five years could be planned and the appeal made on the basis of a supply for a world need. It would be in terms of millions. The task of raising it could be, and doubtless would be, divided among Christian nations, among

the states of America, and among the cities of these states, and among the various co-operating communions. The appeal, like that for a hospital programme, would have something winsome and inspiring about it that would startle the thought of men and rouse their interest. The element of Christian solidarity, of broad vision, of economic and practical efficiency would commend it to men whose response would be in terms of a certain per cent of the sum needed and asked for.

From these hospitals would go native nurses and native doctors to extend the ministry of healing. With such national, or better international, leadership, the non-Christian national governments would doubtless in many instances co-operate.

From these great Christian universities would go trained teachers, many of whom would be Christians, to spread the truth that makes men free, and do their share to create the lasting bonds of international brotherhood.

In the non-Christian lands, the guarantee

could at least be given and kept that the institutions should at least be kept permanently Christian in tone and teaching, which is more than can be said of many of the universities of America.

Around the institutions could be grouped the theological seminaries designed to train the native ministry of the native Church, and each communion could see to it that the integrity of its position was maintained without compromise.

Perhaps this is as far as a wisely and well-directed programme of co-operative endeavour would think of going at present. To suggest the delimitation of the field of evangelistic work and administrative responsibility would doubtless meet with serious opposition. For the sake of engaging the co-operation of all who might be led to co-operate in the hospital and educational programme, the question of delimiting the field of evangelistic responsibility should not be urged or insisted upon. This is a problem in itself, and could best be left to

another day and to other men. The years that are coming will have new light and new wisdom to contribute to its solution.

It is certainly not well to carry our divisions into the mission field in matters where there is co-operation already at home, as is the case in community and state hospitals and great state and national universities.

In these new movements toward practical unity, in this great united international mission programme, the layman aroused, conscious of mission, trained to think in terms of efficiency, and along lines of corporate endeavour, will have a determining influence in shaping the policy of the Christian Church in the years which lie ahead of us. The laymen may indeed demand that the delimiting chains of ecclesiasticism be broken that in and through this Church they may be given freedom to serve for the larger extension of the Kingdom of Christ.

This Church of ours may, if it will, continue to withhold its official sanction to such limited co-operation as has been suggested. She will

not, however, prevent it. She cannot. Nor can she prevent her laymen from making, as many of them unquestionably will, generous and munificent contributions to the appeal which the programme will make.

The writer feels convinced that the programme and the appeal, in some such form, will confront the Christian Church, in America at least, in the not far-distant future. There are those who may not desire it. This Church cannot prevent it, even if she would, by either silence or the refusal to give to the endeavour her official sanction.

That this Church should refuse to consent to such limited and clearly defined co-operation would seem almost unthinkable. That she should authorise her official Board of Missions to so confer and co-operate would be, in the judgment of many, the part of far-sighted wisdom. If serious objection should be made to this, then the Church should be willing to authorise the Board of Missions to appoint representatives to engage in such conferences and co-operation,

appointing those who would welcome the opportunity of doing so. In the presence of the vision of so great an opportunity for this Church to make her influence and leadership felt, one feels humiliated by the thought of the possibility that the Church might dare to refuse. For her to do so would make it impossible for her to share in the credit and glory of the enterprise to which the contributions which would be made by her broad-visioned laymen would entitle her. It would also preclude the possibility of her exerting her influence in the administration and control of the institutions founded under this programme. And it would be a concession to the theories of those in the Church whose opposition would be largely founded upon interpretations of the ministerial orders which the Church has never officially sanctioned, and which she should not be expected to sanction, in this exclusive sense, in this indirect way.

The time has come when questions of theory and interpretation, concerning which scholars and priests stand hopelessly divided, should not

be allowed to clog the wheels of progress, or be forced as issues and hindrances into the practical work of the Church. They are questions with which the laity are not primarily and vitally concerned, and this Church should find some way, and find it as soon as possible, by which those who are untrammelled by unauthorised exclusive interpretations may, with her sanction and blessing, respond to what they very earnestly believe to be the clear call of Christ to their conscience and to His Church.

CHAPTER XLIV

THE RESTRAINT OF POWER

THE token and sign of true greatness of spirit and power is never so clearly evident as it is in its restraint. This is the marvel and the wonder of the life and power of God. There are forces in nature which, if unbound, would in a moment annihilate the universe. The world exists by the marvel of the providence which restrains created force. The vast patience of God is manifested in the restraint of justice by the power of mercy. The masterful majesty of Christ was shown when, with the power to summon to His aid "twelve legions of angels," He suffered Himself to be betrayed by a kiss, and to be led to judgment and to crucifixion by the unrestrained malice and fury

of the mob. That the devil and his angels are not self-restrained, is proof of the limitation, and prophetic of the ultimate overthrow of their power.

Those who hold, by reason of their majority, the power to impose their will upon the whole Church, will, if they be imbued with the restraining presence of the all-powerful Spirit of God, refrain from seeking to crush the liberties of those who are at their mercy.

The majority may rightly insist upon their liberty to act in conformity with their convictions; they may not, without tyranny, demand that others of contrary conviction be compelled to act with them.

If, for example, in the case of the Panama Conference, the Bishop of the missionary jurisdiction of Panama, or a missionary Bishop of Porto Rico or Mexico had been ordered to attend this convention, either by the Board of Missions, or by the General Convention, it would have been a tyranny of the majority. If the President of the Board, or any member of

it, had been ordered to go as a delegate, it would have been an act of tyranny. If, in view of a protest, funds contributed by the General Church, where divergent views obtain, had been voted to defray the expenses of a conference opposed by a minority, this too would have shown the lack of restraint of power.

None of these things was done. That those should have been delegated to go who would choose to accept, and make use of their credentials, was not in any way an act of oppression; nor did it show a disregard for the views of others. The right of the minority to express their views, and to act in accordance with them, was freely accorded on the one hand, and fully exercised on the other.

For the minority to have insisted that a representative missionary organisation did not have the *right* to send those who were willing to go to a conference where the facts and conditions of half a continent were to be reviewed and considered, seems a contention which could not be assented to without a forfeiture of what

would seem to be a reasonable responsibility; and in view of the fact that the Church has accredited bishops and other missionaries working in this field which was to be placed under review, it would seem that the Board would have declined to meet a definite missionary obligation had it refused to send those, who were perfectly willing to go, to learn more of the facts and conditions upon which, of necessity, an intelligent missionary policy must be based and prosecuted. That the money contributed by the minority was not voted to defray the expense of this mission, and that the views of the minority were respected and safeguarded by resolutions restricting the powers of delegates sent to the point of listening and talking, shows the exercise of the power of restraint in a measure which, to the Board, has not been, by the minority, very graciously accorded.*

* Until the *rights* of the Board of Missions are clearly determined and defined, such controversies are ever liable to take place. It was for the purpose of defining these rights that a resolution was introduced in, and passed by, the House of Deputies in the General Convention of 1913. Had this reso-

lution been either passed or defeated by both Houses, the Panama Conference controversy would doubtless have been obviated, as the rights of the Board would then have been clearly defined. The discussion as to the *wisdom* of participation would not have caused such bitterness of contention had the question of the *rights* of the Board been clearly and judicially defined. The following is the resolution referred to:

"*Whereas,* this Church, through its General Convention, has repeatedly urged that the ties which bind Christian people should be strengthened, and that the Church should seek to co-operate with Christian people, not in communion with this Church, in the effort to extend the Kingdom of God in so far as such co-operation can be engaged in in loyalty to the faith and order of this Church;

"*And whereas,* the Board of Missions of this Church has been invited to co-operate with other Christian Boards of Missions in matters pertaining to the ways and means of extending the Kingdom of God;

"*Resolved,* the House of Bishops concurring, That the Board of Missions is informed that in the judgment of the General Convention it has full authority to take such steps as it may deem wise to co-operate with other Christian Boards of Missions in this country and elsewhere, in united efforts to arouse, organise and direct the missionary spirit and activity of Christian people, to the end that the people of the Church may be enabled the better to discharge their duty to support the Mission of the Church at home and abroad through prayer, work and giving. *Provided,* That the expense incurred in such co-operative educational efforts shall not be a charge upon funds raised through the Apportionment." (*General Convention Journal,* 1913, p. 320.)

CHAPTER XLV

A CONFERENCE AND CO-OPERATIVE COMMISSION

THERE are many in this Church who feel convinced that, so long as compulsion is not used to require those to enter into conference and co-operative relationship, who, as individuals, do not wish to do so, the official boards and commissions of this Church already "*have* full authority" to engage in such conference relationship as they may determine upon.

It would seem reasonable and right to insist that, within certain designated limits, our official boards and commissions should be left free (or, if not now free, given freedom) to confer and co-operate with other men and ministers

and boards in promoting matters of common concern for the general welfare of the Church. In such matters as now enlist the co-operation of earnest Christian men, such as publishing literature, providing for the care of the sick, and for educating the ignorant and impoverished masses at home or abroad, there should be no question as to the right and duty of conference and practical and common sense co-operation. There is no reason why theories or facts concerning imperilled orders should be injected into the consideration of this aspect of the question.

If, however, objection be raised against allowing the Board of Missions and Commissions of the General Church to enter officially into co-operative relationship with others upon undetermined issues, by reason of the distinctly representative character of the Board and Commissions, then it might be well to consider the advisability of having the General Convention appoint a Commission composed of those who favour and desire such liberty, to be official-

ly appointed to represent that element in the Church who are convinced that such conference and co-operative endeavour would advance the interests of the Kingdom of God, and be for the good of this Church. Should such a Commission be appointed, with power to add to its numbers, then, in cases where unforeseen conference or co-operative opportunities arose concerning missions, social service, religious education, temperance, or world peace, or international reconstruction, then those of our official Boards and Commissions who were willing to serve on this suggested Commission of Conference and Co-operation could, from time to time, be added to its membership, that the Commission might have the benefit of their knowledge and experience in the special conference or co-operative undertakings in which, from time to time, it might be engaged. The funds for such purpose could be secured by the special Commission from interested churchmen.

If, with reference to legislation authorising conference and co-operative relationship with

other Christian communions, this liberal spirit could prevail, the comprehensiveness desired would be secured without bitterness and without controversy, and this Church would make her influence largely felt in the outworking of the forces which are seeking to establish the Kingdom of God more widely and more firmly on the earth.

CHAPTER XLVI

THE TEMPORARY NATURE AND THE MISSION OF FEDERATED MOVEMENTS

IN the discussions current relative to the value of such federated movements as are represented by "The Federal Council of Churches," and the "Laymen's Missionary Movement," the disposition is constantly shown to throw the question involved upon one or the other of the two horns of a dilemma, and then to pass judgment upon the subject as thus presented as though there were no other alternatives of value possible. On the one hand it is stated that such federation "is a most unhappy substitute for unity"; * while, on the other hand, it is asserted that "the position on which the federa-

* "The Living Church."

tion is based is that the denominations are not to disappear.'"*

If these were the only alternative ideas represented by such federated endeavour, many who favour it would be unconditionally opposed to such endeavours. There are those, however, who decline to be forced upon either one or the other of these horns, so sharply defined and clearly presented, who nevertheless favour such federated endeavour for reasons which seem to them good and sufficient. They do not for a moment consider such federation in any sense whatsoever as being, or as intending to be, a transient or permanent *substitute* for the visible organic unity of the Church of Christ; nor do they believe that such federated endeavour necessarily expresses the idea that denominational lines are destined to continue, or that they should continue. There are those in this Church who feel called to face the unfortunate conditions which exist with a candid mind, illumined by the hope for an ultimate

* Prof. Mathews.

visible unity. They recognise the fact that at present lines of separation do unhappily divide the Church of Christ, and "hinder us from godly union and concord." They realise that organic visible unity cannot come into existence by a forced process, or by the enactment of resolutions decreeing that it should exist. To them it seems clearly evident that some time seems destined to elapse before the lines of separation are obliterated and visible unity is attained. It is felt that the greater value of organic unity may be made to appear more clearly evident as a result of co-operative endeavour during the testing, sifting and waiting time. It is felt that such federation may minister to the creation of an atmosphere of sympathy and a broader basis of mutual understanding. It is believed that latent and unexpressed forces now resident in the divided Body of Christ may be released for the good of mankind as a result of an earnest effort to combine these spiritual energies in concentrated effort. It is hoped that such federated endeavour will

open new approaches leading to ultimate unity; and it is believed that, as a result of mutual understanding, and closer sympathy, and a deeper realisation of our need of each other, the unhappiness of our divisions will become more clearly apparent.

The harm and waste of denominational rivalry is becoming more clearly evident. The value of the denominations as witnesses to neglected aspects of truth, and as ministers to neglected elements in the great family of God, may now be said to be a fast-diminishing value. The light reflected from many angles has been seen in its prismatic variety of colour. It was needful that it should be so seen to be known and appreciated. The need now seems to be that the light should be focussed with a common aim and purpose, and from a unified, organic centre. The problem of how to synthesise the light of truth now faces us. The Church that is blind to the rays of light which others see, in which others have walked, and to which others have borne witness, is not destined to be the

Church of the reconciliation. It would seem that the policy of sound wisdom would be to bring the fragmented crystals close enough together to see what beauty and power of light might be revealed as approaches are made to unity. What each denomination has held and tested and found to be of permanent value should be sought for, and thankfully admitted, and carefully conserved. The separated ray of light may be of a colour that beats with hurtful intensity upon the sensitive soul of the artist. If, however, he is wise, if he be indeed a true artist, he will not shun and despise that separated ray. He will think rather of the richer and more beautiful colour which will become visible when that ray has been blended with others. He will recognise it as essential to an ultimate harmony.

At times we are too much disposed to patent the make of the prism which refracts the light rather than to conserve and use the rays of light refracted. "More light" is the dark world's need. Denominations have been light refrac-

tors. They may still serve this purpose. They have also been light obscurers. The question which must be candidly and honestly determined is: does the amount and distinctive quality of the light refracted and reflected by a denomination compensate sufficiently for the amount of light obscured, or dissipated, to justify its continued existence? The testing time, the value-measuring process, will doubtless have to go on for a while longer. It is distinctly encouraging that a disposition is fast developing to converge the rays, and to test their blending powers.

Such movements as the "Federated Council of Churches" and the "Laymen's Missionary Movement" furnish an excellent opportunity for experimenting to ascertain light values, and the possibilities for light blending, and light concentration. They are not ultimate endeavours. As ends in themselves they would be ill-advised. As means to an ultimate end, they can, if wisely used, be made to serve a valuable purpose. Unity cannot be forced. It does not come by

a killing process. It is not merely a survival of the fittest. It is a creative process. It is corrective, and assimilative, and constructive. It teaches men and organisations when and how to die, that in giving their life they may find it more abundantly. It sympathetically studies the unfit, the disproportionate, the dwarfed and distorted, and seeks to make them fit to survive. Unity does not come by adding irreconcilables, but by reconciling those who differ, by inspiring them with a common spirit, a common hope, a common purpose, a common love, and a common faith in things eternally essential. In the light of this inspiration, differences which seemed irreconcilable vanish from the foreground of consciousness, as the things vital and of eternal significance grip the heart and mind and dominate the will to sacrifice and to serve.

We do not know each other. How can we then love each other? Federations and movements are transient opportunities in the life of the Church in its transition toward ultimate unity. They serve to give introductions to men in-

spired by a common divine purpose. They are neither substitutes for unity, nor seals of approval upon disunity. They are valuable only in so far as they are regarded as elements in the creative processes of the Spirit of Christ, who is seeking in the chaos which men's minds have made to build a Body which shall, through the power of a great divine love and a perfect faith, be fitly framed together into ultimate unity.

We have a long way to go. Across the way which lies ahead falls the shadow of the cross. Yonder is Golgotha, the place of the skull. Perhaps it was called so to suggest the crucifixion of just that part of us, that the life and love that transcend the reason, and all mental processes, might be unchained from the limitations of pride and prejudice and delimited mental "orthodoxy" and find their freedom and work their way to unity.

If Federated Councils of Churches exist to say that we have passed up to Calvary, and have there been crucified, then they are blind guides

to the blind. If denominationalism stands afar off, and refuses to climb to its cross, or seeks to avoid Calvary by accepting a snug place in the Federated Council, then unity must await the disillusionment. If, however, Federated Councils and co-operative movements can serve to open the approaches to the cross of sacrifice; if they can help to create in the Church a more far-reaching and a clearer power of vision; if they can deepen, strengthen and broaden our sympathy and our courage; if they can lead men of many minds to kneel with the Master of us all beneath the olive trees of Gethsemane; if they can help point the way to the offering which He calls us to make, which must be made precedent to an ultimate unity; then these federated endeavours will help lead the way to the answer of the Master's prayer that we all may be one.

THE PROBLEM PRESSURE

A way to progress is sometimes opened by the strong pressure of vital problems which

surge against the bulwarks of ecclesiasticism, and the man-made wall of separation. The vast latent potency of eternal truth unexpressed; the imperious pressure of the divine will against humanly created limitations is sure to produce results. In that day the destiny of the Church will be determined by its responsiveness, and by its ability to float, as an ark, on the flood tide of the eternal purpose. The dam is doomed.

In any co-operative endeavour which may be undertaken, mistakes are sure to be made. It were better, however, to learn from our mistakes how to reach the far goal of truth and unity, than to stand idle in the presence of these problems which press upon us. A more perfect love, which will grow with a clearer understanding of each other, will cast out many fears, and help break the chains of prejudice and apprehension, which must of necessity be broken before organic unity is possible. As Bishop Coxe observed, we are not to-day privileged to speak as Cyprian did to an undivided Church. Our work, of necessity, has to be done under

different conditions. Holding tenaciously to our convictions with one hand, we may stretch forth the other to co-operate with those who hold with us at least a common saving faith and a desire to express that faith in Christian service.

These federated movements may serve as transient means to help us, as Browning says, to

> "Conceive of truth
> And yearn to gain it, catching at mistake
> As midway help till *we* reach fact indeed."

CHAPTER XLVII

FEDERATION AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

AMONG the important problems pressing for solution is the great and vital problem of what is commonly called "Religious Education," namely, the problem of educating the religious nature. The question of devising means by which the souls of children may be educated in conjunction with the development of their bodies, and the education of their minds, needs to be settled, and settled wisely, and without delay. It calls for the concerted action of all those who believe that children have souls, and that there are forces of illumination and power, divinely constituted, by which the soul may be educated if the point of contact can be

established. Co-operation is essential in order to establish and maintain this point of contact.

In the realms of higher education the problem is no less serious. It is interesting to note some of the processes out of which this problem has arisen. It may help to point the way to a solution.

Most of our American universities, which have been in existence for a hundred years, were founded in the faith and enthusiasm of ecclesiastical and denominational conviction. This was true of Harvard, William and Mary, Princeton, Columbia and Yale and many other great institutions of learning. Conscious of a responsibility to be the bulwarks and defenders of the beliefs of their respective founders and benefactors, these institutions, and the men trained in them, consecrated themselves to defend and propagate the distinctive dogmas and ecclesiastical tenets of their founders and followers. Their early presidents were learned doctors of the most orthodox divinity.

This resulted in the over emphasis of sep-

arated doctrinal and ecclesiastical contentions. Shadows, dark and grotesque, were thrown across the path of faith. Souls, made for the light, began at last to shudder and to grow chill. Shibboleths were made the tests of loyalty. Traditionalism fettered the soul. Theories were propounded, and declared essential to the existence of the Church, and as generally necessary to salvation. Then science and philosophy began to speak in terms of freedom. Their dogmatism was no less dogmatic, but it was less ancient. There were fewer facts to the contrary. Students had their minds turned from the chains being forged in laboratory and lecture room, by the flash of the sparks made by hammer blows which fell, fast and furious, upon the age-long chains of ecclesiastical tradition and theological dogmatism.

While the ancient chains were being broken, the new chains of rationalism and materialism were being forged. The unconscious rebound was from one cell in the prison house into another. From the chains of dogmatism, forged

by the narrow process of deductive reasoning, men passed into captivity under the chains forged through the process of hasty generalisation in the inductive process of reasoning. The collegiate mind passed from the bondage of the grotesque dogmas of traditionalism into the bondage of chains forged, and still being forged, in crucibles, and retorts, and in the laboratories of materialistic philosophers, from which God had been excluded because He could not be found with the microscope, or telescope, and because the fact of His presence could not be ascertained by weighing the soul.

Because men have shown ability and genius in the realm of their academic specialty, they have been allowed to believe, and to make others believe, that they could speak with the authority of their accredited position, concerning God, the soul, and immortality, and all other things pertaining to spiritual life and spiritual relationships. These sceptics, rationalists and materialists who presume to decree the dogmas of unbelief, know, if they would admit it, that

the faculties out of which they speak have been trained by dealing with material things, and with visible phenomena, and are, therefore, not trained or competent to judge concerning God and the soul, and the things which pertain to the world which lies beyond the natural order.

On the other hand, the Church, enchained to the non-essential, is not able to speak with authority concerning the things which are essential. Her voice is too often drowned by the clank of her chains. With men all about her bound "in captivity to sin and death," she has at times been content to contend as to whether they were predestined to eternal torment, or capable of freedom of will. Then, too, the means of grace by which their freedom might be secured have been delimited to certain theories of ministerial succession, and to the material form and substance and method of sacramental ministration. It is the chained God who has been expelled from so many of our colleges and universities. It is largely because the Church has bound and fettered the Christ that He has been

put on probation by the collegiate mind. The unchained god of this world has been allowed the dominant place. He has turned the currents of education into the channels of materialism. He has set up false standards of success. He has unreasoningly exalted reason. He has blinded men's eyes to the truth that makes men free. He has made the dogmas of doubt to become dominant. He has decreed that the purpose of education is primarily to enable men to make a living, or a fortune, and has hidden from view the real purpose of education which is the enrichment of life, and the development of its capacity to correspond with its whole environment, which includes God, and the eternal years of the soul's destiny.

In the meanwhile, the youth of our land are leaving their homes, and their parish churches, to be plunged, all unprepared, into this vortex of scepticism and materialistic philosophy, with no clear voice to call them to a high point of vision, with no polar star amid the whirling star dust, and with no authoritative pronounce-

ment relative to the essential truth and fundamental verities of the Christian faith.

It would be a tragedy to be compelled to wait for some solution to this serious problem until Conferences on Faith and Order had finally solved the great and important question of visible organic Church unity. Souls are daily passing into this vortex of doubt and unbelief. It is the business of the Christian Church, and of Christian Colleges, to help them. They have the right to expect it. They have a birthright, as children of the Christian Church, to ask that the essential things be made clear to them, and that a light that surely and constantly shines be set in our colleges and universities to help save them from the shipwreck of their faith.

One mission of the Federated Council of Churches might well be to seek to bring about some federated action on the part of the various Boards of Religious Education looking to some practical solution of this grave and pressing problem. No one Church can solve the diffi-

culty. As Mr. George Wharton Pepper has said, "We Christians of the several communions have so long distrusted one another that we indulge a presumption against any plan put forward by a group other than our own."* The obvious way to avoid this difficulty is to have a plan formulated and put into operation by the various "groups" co-operating

> "in opening out a way
> Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape."

The bid for patronage and for endowments has been an influential factor in eliminating the denominational emphasis from most educational institutions once under Church control. If this shall result in the loss of Christian character, the value of the endowments is very questionable; and, unless something is done to give the assurance that the Christian faith shall not be compromised and repudiated, there is sure to be a demand for a return to the denominational college and university. It would seem, however,

*"A Voice from the Crowd," p. 126.

that by concerted action, a way could be found by which educational institutions which desire to maintain the fundamental convictions of faith, could make those convictions authoritatively known. The unauthorised pronouncements of individual professors would then be known to be the unwarranted sentiments of individuals officially repudiated. They would lack what they now have, namely, the seeming silent sanction of the university. These phosphorescent lights would then be taken from the academic towers, and placed where their glow and reach would depend upon their intrinsic merit. The light that shines from the tower should be the Light of Life, and the university that seeks Christian patronage, should place it there, and see that it is kept burning and that the windows from which it shines are not darkened.

Most universities and colleges would doubtless welcome any suggestion which the Federated Boards of Religious Education would make, and would gladly co-operate in any pro-

gramme which had back of it the consensus of Christian thought and conviction.

The fear of compromising official order or dignity by entering into such a federated endeavour is a fear which would suggest that the ecclesiastical soul had so far lost its sense of proportion and its power of vision as to make it completely blind to the peril in which thousands of the Church's children are daily placed in the presence of the rationalistic and materialistic doubt and scepticism which honeycomb many of the universities and colleges which they attend.

The very serious question arises as to how much respect these students will have for the faith and order of the Church which, entrenched behind the bulwarks of consistency and dignity, refused to co-operate in an effort to create in our colleges and universities a Christian environment for the education of their souls, and the development of their faith.

CHAPTER XLVIII

THE PRICE OF CONSISTENCY

IT has been said of consistency that it is a jewel. We venture to assert that it is often a shackle forged into some corner of a man's mind that keeps his personality from liberty and progress. He who fears being inconsistent is afraid of truth, or is restrained as a seeker after truth. What he thought yesterday, what he thinks to-day, holds him fast. The larger truth beckons. He stands pat. He knows where he is now, he knows not where he will land if he ventures to step forward. He fears to trust his sympathies, and is sceptical as to the promptings of his deeper emotions. He is a trustee. The talent must be kept wrapped in a napkin, or else put into competition with other

talents. To merge it in any co-operative enterprise would be inconsistent with his consciousness of trust. The gold might rust, or become tarnished if placed in a common treasury with silver and nickel and copper currency. Somehow he seems to doubt the power of Him, whose sure image he knows is stamped deep into His golden coin, to keep track of it if it is merged in some corporate enterprise. The Master whose coin it is might get mixed in His accounting, and let this rarest coin of His currency get lost, or become debased.

In dealing with eternal truth, we cannot always be consistent. Our theories are but the reflections of the light of truth from the angles of our mind. Of course, if the angle is a polished crystal set firm in an immutable socket, it will continue forever to reflect the one ray of light that falls upon it. But it were pure ignorance to claim that this ray was the full revelation of the glory of the sun. And shall he be accounted criminally inconsistent who largely trusts the spiritual conviction which prompts

him to co-operate with those who are co-workers with Christ, because the light has not succeeded in reaching them along the path which it follows in reaching us? His heart, his faith, may not square with his logic. But who cares? The question is, which is the bigger, the more vital, the more Christlike; the love, and sympathy, and common faith which build men into fellowship, or the logical consistency of thought which puffs them up, and which builds barriers which keep them from dwelling together in the unity of spirit and the bond of peace, and in a deep devotion to the common purpose of saving men with a great, catholic purpose from the heresy of sin and the schism of separation from the Saviour of men?

CHAPTER XLIX

THE QUESTION OF UNITY

IT is insisted that there can be no unity without the apostolic succession. Has it been proven that, in any age of the Church's history, there has been unity with it? The essential value of the historic episcopate as a means to secure and preserve the organic visible unity of the Church may and should be urged and maintained; but there are other forces which need to be considered which must of necessity be considered precedent to this, without which no outward uniformity of order would be permanent and spiritually potent. There was a perfectly regular and valid ministry while the apostles were on earth, and yet there were divisions among them, some going to the Jews, and others

to the Gentiles, as a result of this very question of an ancient succession. In the Churches to which they ministered there was a woful lack of unity. St. Paul writes to Corinth, "I hear that there be divisions among you, and verily I believe it." Some were claiming to be of Paul the apostle to the Gentiles; some of Cephas the apostle of the circumcision, and others still of Apollos. St. Paul calls this fleshly contention. For, says he, "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos but ministers by whom ye believed? . . . Therefore let no man glory in men, for ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." The schism which, however, he most deplores is that which was occasioned by sin cutting off members of the Body of Christ from communion and fellowship with Him.

This is surely the kind of schism which ministers of the apostolic succession of spirit will ever most deeply deplore. Sin is the great maker of schism in the Body of Christ. It sunders souls from Him. We should surely find some other name than "schismatics" for those

who are spending their lives at home amid privations, and in far-away lands amid perils, seeking to build souls into the Body of Christ, and endeavouring, through prayer and labour, to heal the schisms which sin is making. If we are in earnest in our hatred of schism, we will seek closer fellowship with those who are spending themselves in seeking to heal and prevent the mortal schism made by vice and sin in the Body of our common Lord and Master.

Somehow there is a very deep feeling, which transcends the power of words to describe, that we are after all, perhaps, failing to put the emphasis just where it is most needed in considering those things which make for the unity of the Body of Christ.

There are many who have been born and reared in this Church, who cherish her beautiful liturgy, who revere her ancient heritage, who hold her unbroken continuity through orders and sacraments as a rare and priceless possession and trust, and who are deeply

conscious of the depth and richness of her balanced teaching; who feel that her place would be more glorious if she were made free to gladly acknowledge the irregular ministry and sacraments of those who, for reasons over which, in many instances, they had no control, were separated from the regularity of ordered succession as this Church has retained it, and yet, who, with what we regard as a handicap, have fought a good fight, kept the faith which unites the souls of men with the saving Christ, and have, through what Bishop Doane calls a valid, though irregular ministry, built millions of immortal souls into deathless union with the Lord of life.

What credentials, what larger, richer and more golden harvest have we to show in proof of the fact that what we regard as a priceless heritage, is of such closeness with the apostles that such a measure of special grace and power flows into us and through us by way of this special and exclusive channel, as to justify us in withholding fellowship, conference and co-

operation from those who, without this special means of grace, are empowered by the Holy Ghost for the work of their ministry in building the Father's children into the Body of His Son?

CHAPTER L

THE VISION OF THE SON OF MAN

THE Master stands in the silence there upon a mount called Olivet. Below is the City of Zion, proud of its ancient heritage, and unquestionably conscious of its orthodoxy. From its centre rises the ancient temple of Jehovah. At its altar minister the priests of the ancient, divinely appointed order and of unbroken succession in the tribe of Levi. From its altar rises the smoke of the divinely appointed sacrifice. "Beholding the city, He wept over it, saying, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem."

"And there they crucify Him." The years pass. An army encircles the city's walls. Not one stone is left upon another. "How often would I have gathered thee together; and ye

would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."

Invisible He stands to-day among us. Our eyes are holden and we know Him not. He calls. Our ears are deaf and we hear Him not. He weeps over the tragedy of the world, and over the tragedy of His Church. What is He saying?

May God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost give grace to His Church that she may hear and obey what the Master says as He looks down upon us and weeps. May He grant that we may not be destined through disobedience to His voice to hear about us the falling of the stones of a temple left desolate.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BV 600

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 014 479 754 1